DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 260 FL 004 318

AUTHOR	Paquette, F. Andre; Tollinger, Suzanne
TITLE	A Handbook on Placement in Foreign Languages in Colleges and Universities, Part Three, Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Institute of International Studies (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 68
CONTRACT	OEC-1-6-062619-1876
NOTE	107p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Articulation (Program); *College Curriculum; Curriculum Planning; Instructional Improvement; *Language Instruction; *Modern Languages; *Program Development; Second Language Learning; Student Attitudes; Student Placement

ABSTRACT

This handbook is the culmination of an examination of problems encountered in the articulation of foreign language programs from secondary schools to college. The report contains the results of discussions with the chairmen of language departments at the college level and the examining committee, the findings obtained from on-campus interviews, and written responses to direct solicitation for advice. Sections include: (1) introduction: project background and rationale; (2) description of project activities; (3) fifteen case studies: some common assumptions; (4) publications and position papers: a summary of observations and recommendations; (5) a new approach to college language placement; and (6) several appendixes relating to this project. Included among these papers are several selected publications, position papers, and "The Foreign Language Program in Washoe County and the University of Nevada," by C.W.F. Melz. (RL)

ED 081260

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OEC-1-6-062619-1876

F. Andre Paquette
Suzanne Tollinger
Modern Language Association of America
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Part Three

A HANDBOOK ON PLACEMENT IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Institute of International Studies

Title VI, Section 602, NDEA

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FL 004 318

FINAL REPORT

CONTRACT NO. OEC-1-6-062619-1876

PART THREE

A HANDBOOK ON PLACEMENT IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

F. Andre Paquette
Suzanne Tollinger
Modern Language Association of America
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011

JUNE 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Institute of International Studies

Title VI, Section 602, NDEA

A HANDBOOK ON PLACEMENT IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

June 1968

by

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

F. André Paquette, Project Director
Suzanne Tollinger, Research Assistant

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

DEDICATORY PREFACE

The project which led to the publication of this Handbook was possible because of the cooperation of many individuals and institutions. The MLA is especially grateful to the cooperating chairmen and their institutions.

The MLA was able to conduct this project in cooperation with the College Entrance Examination Board through its representative, Professor Edward S. Noyes. "Ned" brought wisdom and wit to every aspect of the project--except its final phases. His untimely death during the project saddened the staff and weakened this final product. The staff is sure that it has captured at least the spirit of what Ned foresaw; and we believe that any success which results from this Handbook is due to his insight. His good counsel was missed. It will be missed.

F.A.P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedicatory Preface.....

I. Introduction: Project Background and Rationale..

II. Description of Project Activities.....

III. Fifteen Case Studies: Some Common Assumptions...

IV. Publications and Position Papers: A Summary of Observations and Recommendations.....

V. A New Approach to College Foreign Language Placement.....

VI. Appendices

A. Roster of Participating Chairmen and Institutions.....

B. Outline for Chairman's Description.....

C. 1. Planning Document: Follow-up Visits by MLA-CEEB Representatives.....

2. Sample Schedule of Follow-up Visits.....

3. Interview Guidelines for Follow-up Visits.....

D. Selected Publications and Position Papers....

E. "The Foreign Language Program in Washoe County and the University of Nevada," A Survey by C.W.F. Melz.....

I. INTRODUCTION: PROJECT BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

When the academic reform movement in foreign language study was begun by the Modern Language Association (MLA) in the early 1950's, an apparently minor educational problem became a monumental one: continuity (articulation) of instruction from one grade level to the next and from one administrative unit to another. Prior to the reform, there was, in effect, a national curriculum: two, three, or at best, four years of a grammar-translation approach in high school, followed by a standardized test--which worked very well for placement in college, followed by even more grammar and translation of literature. There were only a few notable exceptions, the most well-known being the "Cleveland Plan" initiated by Emile B. deSauzé around 1919.

Then, the MLA began to promote the introduction of foreign language study into the elementary school curriculum. At the high school and college levels, the reformers pleaded for broader objectives sequenced in a specific way. Listening comprehension and speaking ability were not only desirable objectives in themselves, they were declared indispensable antecedents to the achievement of the reading and writing skills. Many individuals and institutions responded to these proposals, but many others remained convinced of the efficacy

of the "traditional" objectives and approach. The consequences were predictable. At the local level, the problem of continuity became a function of the number of independent elementary school districts feeding into a smaller number of junior high school districts which, in turn, fed into an even smaller number of high school districts. At the national level, the problem increased in geometric proportion to 1) the number of high schools, 2) sending an increasing number of students to, 3) thousands of two and four-year colleges and universities.

Since the MLA, through its members and in its publications, stressed the importance of the "cumulative" nature of language learning, it was natural for the Association to address itself to the national aspect of the problem: continuity from school to college.

The MLA based its initiative on a 1965 report of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. "The fact that colleges and secondary schools are still exchanging accusations indicates that in spite of the frequent exchange of ideas at professional meetings and in publications, we seem to be operating in separate circles that too often extend no farther than the walls of our own institutions. Colleges are supposed to continue the foreign language instruction begun in secondary school, but, in fact, many college instructors know little about the preparation which entering freshmen have received. Each language department in each

college has its own standards and goals, but how much does the average high school teacher know about them?"[1]

"Too many students fail foreign languages or are discouraged from pursuing their study of them because they are misplaced.... The student who is challenged on fair grounds, in a class where he belongs, is more likely to work hard and to enjoy the learning of a language than the student who struggles and flounders in a class too advanced for him or the student who is simply repeating what he has already learned."[2]

The MLA had frequently received letters echoing the concern voiced in the 1965 Northeast Conference report for information on college foreign language placement. At its February 1966 meeting, the MLA Test Advisory Committee stressed the need for the profession to examine college placement practices. The College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) indicated its concern by agreeing to participate with the MLA in the activities.

The "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages,"[3] endorsed by both the MLA and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), reflects the concern of the profession for good college placement programs in foreign languages. The Guidelines state that "an institution that seeks approval

of its Teacher Education Program in Modern Foreign Languages" should demonstrate that it "evaluates the previous language experience of all applicants for admission to the institution as well as that of applicants to the modern foreign language teacher education program through the use of proficiency tests in the four language skills. It uses the results of such evaluation for student placement in modern foreign language instruction."

This, in brief, is the context within which the activities leading to the publication of this Handbook were initiated.

[1]Micheline Dufau, Chairman, "From School to College: The Problem of Continuity," Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession. Reports of the Working Committees, Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1965, ed. G. Reginald Bishop, Jr. (Princeton, New Jersey, 1965), p. 105.

[2]Ibid., p. 110.

[3]"Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages," PMLA, LXXXI (May 1966).

II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

A conference of fifteen chairmen of modern foreign language departments served as a focal point for discussion of college foreign language placement. To assure balanced involvement of members of the profession in the project, chairmen were selected to represent a broad range of state, private, small, and large colleges and universities. (Appendix A is a list of participating chairmen and their institutions.)

In preparation for the conference each chairman prepared a description of his institution and its actual foreign language placement practices. The descriptions served as the basis for discussions which led to a preliminary list of placement problems, general recommendations for improvement of practices, and specific suggestions for this Handbook. (Appendix B is the outline which each chairman was asked to follow in preparing his description for the conference.)

Following the conference of chairmen, the MLA Director of Testing, an MLA research assistant, and a representative of CEEB conducted follow-up studies of the practices reported by the fifteen chairmen. (Agreement to these campus visits was a condition for selection of participating chairmen.) The purpose of the follow-up studies was to validate and elaborate information contained in each chairman's description through structured interviews of selected instructors and

students. (Appendix C contains the planning document and interview guides used during the campus visits.) All three members of the project staff used the same guides for interviews and followed comparable ratios of students and instructors on all campuses. Where available, standardized test data on participating students, and all other students, were studied.

Throughout the period of the project, at professional meetings and through correspondence, the project staff solicited identification of problems and proposed solutions relating to the broad issue of continuity in foreign language study. More than two hundred individuals, local teachers' groups, state foreign language associations and advisory committees, and national groups responded to the appeals with letters, publications, and position papers. (Appendix D contains reprints of selected, comprehensive responses.)

Finally, the MLA staff prepared this Handbook based on the three major phases of the project: 1) the results of the conference of chairmen, 2) the results of the on-campus interviews, and 3) the written responses to the direct solicitation for advice.

III. FIFTEEN CASE STUDIES: SOME COMMON ASSUMPTIONS

The list of assumptions which follows is not intended to imply that every institution's practices reflected every assumption. However, every assumption is shared--explicitly or implicitly--by at least one-third of the institutions involved in the project. The list is based on the reports of chairmen and the results of follow-up visits.

Assumption #1

One year of high school foreign language study can be equated to one semester (or quarter) of college foreign language study.

Assumption #2

You can place a student effectively if you know his high school and his foreign language teachers

Assumption #3

If an institution has no foreign language entrance requirement, there is no reason to invest much energy in comprehensive placement procedures.

Assumption #4

The general quality of high school foreign language instruction is so low that little attention need be paid to a student's high school experience.

Assumption #5

Given Assumption #4, it is fair to conclude that failures in proper placement can be traced to a poor high school experience.

Assumption #6

For an effective placement program, standardized tests are superior to institutionally prepared ones.

Assumption #7

A highly-structured examination system is superior--because it is objective--to an interview system--a highly subjective procedure.

Assumption #8

A good placement system gets all students into the right courses within a week from the opening of the session.

Assumption #9

Once placement procedures have been implemented, it is academically dishonest to allow a student to receive credit for "repeating" a level he had in high school--even if a student with no foreign language background receives credit for the same course.

Assumption #10

There is nothing academically unsound about placing beginning students and students with one (or sometimes two) years of high school foreign language study in the same beginning section.

Assumption #11

"Any level" of foreign language study at the college level is intrinsically superior--in some undefined and undefinable way--to the "same level" of foreign language instruction at the high school level.

Assumption #12

Since all sections of a course must follow the catalog description, the same objectives, procedures, and content will be pursued.

Assumption #13

Since they do not use "teaching assistants" (graduate students) in language courses, small institutions offer better language instruction at the beginning and intermediate levels.

Assumption #14

Given Assumption #13, no staff training program is needed in small institutions.

If these assumptions seem harshly stated, perhaps the following exerpts from placement policy statements will provide some justification:

1. "Note: This placement policy is only partially successful.
   a) Some willfully fail the test to get an easy course;

b) Beginning students with no previous exposure complain of unfair competition from students with high school experience;

c) There is little real incentive for students to be placed at levels where they will be really challenged."

2. "The foreign language departments of the University of _____ announce a change in the placement procedure for students continuing at the University the study of a foreign language begun in the secondary schools. The present procedure, which has been in effect for four years, consists of placing students in University courses on the basis of scores on national and local tests of reading and listening. Students continue their foreign language study with full University credit if their test scores indicate that their accomplishment is commensurate with the length of their high school study; they are denied credit if the University courses in which they are placed are at a more elementary level than should be expected on the basis of their high school study. This procedure was adopted with the intention of encouraging long sequences of foreign language study by students before entering the University, and of encouraging the maintenance of language competence during the senior high school years.

"The effect of this placement policy has unfortunately been quite different from the one intended, however. The

threat of denial of University credit for continuing language study has led some students to postpone initiating their study of a foreign language until late in their high school careers; it has led others to begin the study of a new language at the University to avoid being penalized for continuing study of a first language at a low level. The former practice is one which is deplored by all authorities on foreign language teaching; the latter has increased the burden of elementary language instruction at the University, a burden which the University expects the schools of the state to assume, as teachers and facilities become available."

3. "Placement practices in the foreign languages rest primarily on performance on language tests. These tests are not mandatory except in the case where a student continues previous language experience from high school. Our difficulty here is that the background of students coming to us is tremendously varied, depending on the particular school and, even more so, the particular instructor in the school responsible for the first introduction to the language. We have not been able to correlate experience based on the number of years studied in high school with performance on standard tests (even accounting for possible malingering). Primary placement then is made either at the beginning level or on the basis of testing at one of the advanced levels in a language course. If, however, the student feels that the

results of the test have been in error and that the placement was wrong, we then proceed to the use of interviews with faculty members in the particular language discipline to attempt to arrive at a satisfactory placement of the student. We have felt, contrary to the general opinion among schools and colleges in the state of _____, that if a test, validated perhaps by personal interview, indicates that despite previous exposure to the language the student should begin at a lower level, we are measuring his present competence and should allow credit for work which is essentially a repetition of what he was supposed to have had. The alternative, it seems to us, is standardization and evaluation of every high school course and this we are not prepared to do."

IV. PUBLICATIONS AND POSITION PAPERS: A SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The more than two hundred publications, position papers, and letters sent to the project staff reveal that failure to provide continuity can be attributed to lack of communication. State and local foreign language supervisors were able to set forth, in fairly precise terms, where they feel either uninformed or "out of step" with their colleagues in colleges and universities. Their observations can be summarized as follows:

1. High schools do not have adequate information about college and university foreign language programs.

2. High schools do not have adequate information about college and university foreign language placement practices--current or planned.

3. High schools do not know what foreign language personnel in colleges and universities expect of their students.

4. High school personnel are extremely disappointed with the failure of their colleagues in colleges and universities to respond to curricular changes which the schools have made in response to the profession's reform movement.

An elaboration of these four points is contained in three documents (see Appendix D) produced by state-wide FL advisory committees; they were selected from among those submitted be-

cause of the way in which they evolved and their comprehensive discussion of the problems of continuity. One additional document is included in Appendix D: a high school teacher's speech which we found to be articulate, to the point, and exemplifying the kind of communication which must develop if the problem of continuity is to be solved.

College personnel, during the conference of chairmen and follow-up units, indicated a need for more than grades to assist them with placement. They requested two kinds of data: 1) more information about high school programs, and 2) more specific information on each student. They, too, recognized the great variations in program objectives and procedures.

V. A NEW APPROACH TO COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

The first major activity in this project, the conference of chairmen, was organized by Edward S. Noyes, the CEEB representative on the project staff. While not a foreign language specialist, and although the follow-up visits were still to be conducted, Dr. Noyes was able to draw on his long experience as an admissions officer at Yale University to synthesize the essence of the chairmen's reports and most of the position papers on continuity. His summary is a sound framework around which may be arranged specific suggestions for improved placement.

"When I worked in admissions, I used to dream about some magic touchstone, some formula which I could apply with a minimum of effort to each applicant and which would infallibly tell me whom to admit, whom to reject. It was only a dream.

"Similarly, I suspect that there may be some who hope for a placement system, simple, infallible, and equally useful to all kinds of institutions. I fear that this, too, is only a dream. There are too many variables involved.

"1. Determining the competence of the student.

"A. Some of you seem to pay little or no attention to the school record. This seems to me an error. I realize that institutions drawing from hundreds of schools cannot

possibly come to know each school. I submit, however, that every bit of liaison can help: the kinds of conferences and two-way visits that ...[some of you] have described (see, Recommended Standards of Foreign Language Instruction, Michigan Department of Education, Appendix D) can give both college faculties and school teachers clearer ideas of what is going on in the other camp. Further, continuing data on the performance of students from the same school will eventually accumulate to a point where a new school record from that school can be interpreted in college X's terms with some degree of accuracy. Colleges drawing from schools within a limited range have, I think, special responsibilities to become acquainted with their feeder schools.

"B. All of you rely, in varying degrees, on tests to establish a student's competence. Wherever possible, the same test or form of a test should be used for all, though in nationally standardized tests a difference in forms used is of minimal importance. It may sound heretical for the representative of a testing organization to warn you against accepting test scores rigidly and blindly, but no test is infallible. Even the best ones will have substantial errors of measurement, so that there is danger of injustice if cut-off scores are in-

flexibly followed. I urge that the school record be consulted before decisions are made on borderline cases.

"C. Interviews. With huge entering freshman enrollments in FL, an interview of each freshman is impossible, but perhaps special cases can be identified where there is some peculiarity in the student's preparation: admissions officers might help in flagging such cases. The interviews should be carried on by faculty who have at least visited some secondary schools and have some ideas about typical school courses in foreign languages.

"2. The college and its offerings.

"A. Courses open to freshmen. If various procedures of placement have been tried and none have worked well, it would seem important to reconsider the nature of the college offerings in light of what has been learned about the preparation of the entering group. Are the courses really adapted to the kind of freshmen the college is getting? You remember the old myth about Procrustes, the bad guy who used to force all travelers through his domain to lie on his bed. If they were too long, he cut off their heads; if they were too short, he used violent means of stretching them, until finally a good guy named Theseus came along and killed Procrustes. In some colleges,

the offerings for freshmen of foreign languages bear a slight resemblance to the bed of Procrustes--or so the students think. I suggest that there may be need for experimentation, if not with new courses, with variations within the framework of the regular courses: some fast sections, for example, or some sections for those who enter from audio-lingually oriented schools: these would be especially valuable in colleges where the orientation is more traditional, and where the kids with competencies in the four skills feel terribly let down if their college courses give no chance to use three of those four.

"B. I suspect that no institution can work out a program of placement likely to be satisfactory over a period of time without being willing to embark on a lot of hard work and self-study. Some FL departments may have members interested in the schools, in follow-up work, and in the not very complex statistical operations necessary. In other places, perhaps the testing bureau or the department of personnel study can be called on for this labor. It involves the accumulation of brief case studies of every student who elects a foreign language course: his record at entrance, his test score, where he was placed, his performance in that course, and whether or not he contin-

ued the study of foreign languages. By the end of three years, patterns for certain types of students will begin to emerge. The placement officer will be able to say: 'This student X, from Y school, with three years of French there and a B average, and with Z score on the placement test, should probably go into French 103 here.' He will not always be right; the chances that he will be will improve as he becomes more knowledgeable about the performance of graduates from various schools at his college, so that he is not going to equate three years at Exeter with three years at Podunk High. Since the standard of work at a school--or at a college--may vary somewhat from year to year, depending on all sorts of causes, such as changes in faculty, it will be necessary to make this kind of work a continuing feature. Without it, I think the chances for a successful placement system are dim.

"C. There remains the very difficult task of evaluating a system, once it is in operation. If practically all the students flunk the courses in which they were placed, there is obviously something rotten in the state of Denmark. But what if they all pass? Is that proof of ideal placement? What about those who may have fudged on the placement test, to ensure being put into a course they know they can handle easily? Comments by instructors--if

their sections are small enough so that they come to know their students--are the best guides here, though one must always watch out for 'teacher's pets' or sheer incompatibility.

"D. Advanced Placement. Gordon Silber and others have noted that some entering freshmen with high competence in the four skills have had great difficulty when placed in literary courses alongside upper-classmen. I am sure that this is true--they lack the maturity for the kind of criticism such courses usually demand. There seems to have been no such difficulty with advanced-placement students as freshmen. I think there are two reasons for this. The advanced-placement group is--whatever their advanced-placement exam score--a very able group. And if they have come through a well-planned advanced-placement program, they probably began, as early as the 10th grade, to do extra work in foreign languages, some of which would tend in the direction of critical analysis; their 12th grade course would have had very heavy emphasis on such work, so that they can usually fit well into a college course in literature. I hope foreign language departments will bear in mind that some high schools lacking an advanced-placement program are still good enough to do a somewhat similar brand of preparation. It would

seem to me an unhappy situation if no entering student except those with advanced placement were ever permitted to take a literary course, though in any given year there might be only a handful.

"E. One last notion, raised by the emphasis I found in the letters from foreign language supervisors on their continuing ignorance about what the colleges are doing and what they want in the way of preparation. I don't honestly believe that many college catalogues are of great assistance in dispelling this ignorance: the course descriptions are often brief; if they do indicate the course content, they say little or nothing about the way in which it is taught. I suggest that foreign language departments might write somewhat longer descriptions of the courses in which entering freshmen are likely to be placed, have these printed in a small brochure and sent to at least the heads of foreign language departments in the schools from which their freshmen normally come. If these are written from the teacher's point of view, telling him briefly but clearly the aim of the college courses and how they try to reach that goal, so that he would not have to wade through a big catalogue for less valuable information, they could be very useful..."

What Dr. Noyes suggested, in effect, is that if we wish to reopen communications--to the benefit of our students--we

must achieve two broad objectives: 1) more candor (truth) in describing our students, our programs, and our college placement practices, and 2) greater clarity and similarity of format in our descriptions. Further, we must shed some of our "moral" convictions (about repetition and credit) which cause undignified and unproductive activities among our students.

We propose that college foreign language placement be based on:

1. A new set of assumptions which all students and teachers accept.

2. A new approach to describing the background and determining the probable success of each student.

3. A new approach to describing school and college foreign language offerings.

4. Several general recommendations for developing a continuing basis for sound placement practices in the future.

A NEW SET OF ASSUMPTIONS FOR COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT PRACTICES

Assumption #1

Any student entering college should be allowed to enroll in any level foreign language course he chooses--regardless of previous high school experience in the foreign language--provided he can pass the end-of-course examination of any prerequisite course.

Assumption #2

Any student who successfully completes any foreign language course offered by a college--regardless of his previous experience in the foreign language at the high school level--should receive credit in the same way as a student does who has not had the same "level" course in high school.[1]

Assumption #3

Placement procedures should be viewed as one aspect of a broad college counselling service--not a regulatory process.

Assumption #4

Placement counselling should reflect recognition of proficiency, however acquired.

Assumption #5

Placement counselling is meaningful only in terms of an individual student.

[1]Are the implications all that bad, really? Let us assume an extreme case: a student who has completed, for example, five levels of French in high school. He elects to take French I and go as far as possible without studying in order to earn easy credit. What happens? He may have enough competence to pass exams, let us say, through the third semester of French. He receives grades of A, A, and C and nine semester hours of credit. He has paid for instruction from which he did not benefit--it's his money after all--and all the institution has done is to recognize proficiency, however acquired. Are we certifying courses sat through or competence and knowledge acquired?

Our only precaution is to see to it that he does not get into a course section with real beginners; we have met our obligation to these students only when we provide for them separately.

A NEW APPROACH TO DESCRIBING THE BACKGROUND AND DETERMINING THE PROBABLE SUCCESS OF EACH STUDENT

The college foreign language department, if it is to be successful in its counselling role, must consider the needs of students of varied backgrounds and attitudes toward language study, with a wide range of linguistic aptitude, and an even wider range of objectives. The school, if it is to make a significant contribution to the counselling process, must provide the college with fundamental information about each student. To both parties, we recommend the use of an Individual Profile Chart such as the one below, which may be used in conjunction with the project interview guidelines (see Appendix C), to elicit critical information.

INDIVIDUAL PROFILE CHART

Student's name:_____

Date of birth:_____Sex:_____

(To be completed by student's last foreign language teacher in high school)

I. Outline of Foreign Language Experience

A. Foreign language spoken at home (Which? How much? etc.)

B. Elementary school foreign language study (language(s), number of years, frequency and length of classes, continuity, etc.)

C. Junior High School foreign language study (language(s), number of years, frequency and length of classes, continuity, etc.)

D. High School foreign language study (language(s), number of years, frequency and length of classes, continuity, name of each teacher, etc.)

E. Travel, Study, or Work Abroad (when, where, program? how long, where lived, where studied, etc.)

II. Testing and Related Data

A. Has the student ever taken any standardized foreign language tests?

	Date	Name of Test	Results (by skill, if possible)
1.			
2.			
3.			

B. Has the student ever taken any foreign language aptitude tests?

	Date	Name of Test	Results (by sub-test, if possible)

C. Has the student ever taken a foreign language attitude questionnaire?

Date:_____Name:_____

Results (narrative summary):_____

D. High School Grade Point Average:_____

E. Senior Class Standing:_____of_____

III. Placement Recommendation: If you have course and program descriptions of the foreign language sequence where the student plans to attend college, in what course do you suggest he (she) be placed?_____

Why?_____

Name of teacher completing this chart_____

Date_____

IV. Additional Information: This form should be accompanied by the school's program and course descriptions.

A NEW APPROACH TO DESCRIBING SCHOOL AND COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

In addition to information about the student, the college should receive a detailed description of the foreign language offerings in the sending high school. Similarly, the high school foreign language teachers should be able to inform students about foreign language programs in colleges which the student is considering. We believe that both schools and colleges should develop program and course descriptions which are more comprehensive than those which normally appear in college catalogues and school registration materials. We recommend that the following guidelines be used to develop more informative descriptions.

AN INFORMATIVE COURSE DESCRIPTION

A. Objectives: This should be a simple, straight-forward statement of the general goal of the course and the specific achievements which the teacher expects successful students to reach.

B. Content: This should set forth the specific works, series of works, areas of language study or language analysis, domain of theatre work, etc., which will be treated in the course.

C. Procedures:

1. How will the course materials be presented and/or

discussed (e.g., in a lecture, seminar, drill session, workshop)?

2. What will be the basic approach to the content (e.g., *explication de textes*, thematic, historical, contrastive analysis, practicum, acting)?

3. What will the total number of contact hours be per week?

4. How will the instructional time units be arranged (e.g., five one-hour lectures and two half-hour periods)?

5. How will students be grouped for each type of instruction (e.g., large groups for lecture and sections of 10 for composition)?

6. How often will quizzes be given? Will there be a mid-term and/or final course examination? (Also see: Grading)

7. What types of independent, out-of-class work will students do, (e.g., course papers, compositions, laboratory work, set construction)? (Also see: Grading)

8. In what language(s) will each part of the course work be carried out?

D. Credit Value: Each course description should indicate the appropriate value assigned to it in terms of the diploma or degree program and the college "major" requirements. For ex-

ample, if courses below a given level do not count toward the "major", this should be clearly indicated.

E. Required Texts: This is a serious part of course preparation because two problems always accompany decisions: 1) frequently, foreign language courses require the use of foreign texts which are often difficult to obtain, becoming more expensive, and are difficult to return, if unused, 2) college students have to purchase texts and references for several courses; this is very expensive--and unnecessarily so if the demands in one course are excessive. (Be sure to provide title, author, edition, publisher, publication date, and, if appropriate, U.S. distributor.) If laboratory supplies such as tapes are required, this should be indicated in this part of the course description.

F. Prerequisites and Suggested Preparation: Every course description should be unambiguous about proficiency or other prerequisites. In addition, both students and teachers will benefit from any background reading or other types of advanced preparation. One condition: "suggested preparation" should be distinguishable from a "prerequisite" in that it should not be essential to successful completion of the course.

G. Grading: A student is likely to be more successful--at least as measured by grades--if he knows clearly what is planned for the course and how he will be graded for his parti-

cipation. What will the student's grade be based on? Activities? Objectives attained? Daily work? Quizzes? Tests? Course paper? What per cent will each of these represent in the final grade? Does this agree with what is described above?

H. Evaluation: Will the course be evaluated by the students? If so, how?

We have provided below two descriptions of an Advanced Spanish course--actually taken from college catalogues; while the second is still not complete, it is clearly more informative than the first one.

Sample #1

Span 211 ADVANCED LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS (VIII)

Emphasis is on the ability to speak and write Spanish with additional intensive training in phonetics. Prerequisite: Spanish IV or equivalent. Three semester hours

Sample #2

1. *ADVANCED SPANISH LANGUAGE*

Objectives: This course is designed to help the student develop his ability to express himself accurately and sensitively on a wide variety of subjects in both oral and written Spanish.

Procedures and content: The course will meet daily (Monday-Friday) for two hours in sections of approximately 10 students

each. Class time will be devoted to beginning compositions, oral discussion of subjects treated in the compositions, and occasional discussion of grammatical and stylistic questions. Each student will be expected to write 12 essays of 400-800 words each. Compositions will be thoroughly corrected and annotated by the instructor. The student will then be required to revise the original essay, incorporating all necessary changes in the final copy. The student is urged to have his own all-Spanish dictionary. The dictionary we suggest is *Diccionario ideológico de la lengua española* by Julio Casares, segunda edición 1953, Editorial Gustavo Gili, Barcelona.

Textbooks:

(1) *Diccionario Duden español*, Barcelona. Colección "Diccionarios por la imagen." (Bound $10.75). (2) *A Textbook of Modern Spanish*, M. M. Ramsey, latest copyright 1956, Holt, Rinehart, Winston, (Rev. ed., by R. K. Spaulding.)

Credits: Six.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING A CONTINUING BASIS FOR SOUND PLACEMENT PRACTICES

Observation #1

The follow-up visits revealed that many institutions used results of standardized tests in reference to national norms rather than in terms of their own programs.

Recommendation #1

Where testing is an integral part of placement counselling, we suggest that an institution develop data based on success (or failure) of students in its own courses. Further, we recommend greater dependence on criterion referenced tests[2] developed by the institution for use in its own program.

Observation #2

In almost every institution "true" beginners were placed at a severe disadvantage by being in sections with "repeaters." Invariably, the course was paced for the latter.

Recommendation #2

"True" beginners should always be provided for in separate sections; moreover, where the institution is large enough, true beginners should be grouped according to results on a linguistic aptitude test.

[2] See the article "Testing," by Rebecca M. Valette, in Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education 1 (1969), 343-374.

Observation #3

No institution visited made any attempt to provide for separating "majors" from other students. In the light of general findings regarding motivation and success in foreign language study, we believe this may account for some failures as well as some dissatisfaction among majors.

Recommendation #3

Several institutions should initiate studies to ascertain whether instrumentally oriented students should be separated from integrationally oriented students.[3]

Observation #4

Many students who were interviewed felt that they were under undue pressure to "get into the right course" by the end of the first week. In our judgment, many students wasted an entire semester because of a hasty placement decision.

Recommendation #4

We urge colleges and universities to allow students who are doubtful to attend two courses for two or three weeks in order to arrive at a sounder placement decision.

[3] See the article "The Physiology and Psychology of Second Language Learning," by Leon A. Jakobovits, in Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education 1 (1969), 181-227.

Observation #5

Students in different sections of the same course (according to the catalogue) described a very distinct course to the interviewers. This can be effective if deliberate and designed to meet the needs of specific students. HOWEVER, THIS WAS NOT CONFIRMED IN THESE CASES.

Recommendation #5

Department chairmen and course coordinators should develop course evaluation procedures which reveal whether or not what is stated in the new course descriptions is what takes place.

Observation #6

One document which was sent to the project staff suggested means by which a broader base of information could be developed for use in counselling students in foreign language study: "The Foreign Language Program in Washoe County and The University of Nevada," A survey by C. W. F. Melz. Excerpts from the study appear in Appendix E; we believe that the "classified comments from college students" reveal as much about their college experiences as they reveal about their high school experiences.

Recommendation #6

We believe that many schools, colleges, and universities could benefit from jointly-sponsored studies similar to the one by Professor Melz.

APPENDIX A

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

ROSTER OF PARTICIPATING CHAIRMEN AND INSTITUTIONS

Theodore Andersson
Department of Romance Languages
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Roger Anton
Department of Foreign Languages
San Bernardino Valley College
701 South Mt. Vernon
San Bernardino, California 92403

Constantine Christofides
Department of Romance Languages
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Mills F. Edgerton
Department of Spanish
Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania 17837

Austin E. Fife
Department of Foreign Languages
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84321

Edward Geary
Department of Romance Languages
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine 04011

William N. Hughes
Department of German and Russian
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Colonel Alfonse R. Miele
Department of Foreign Languages
U.S. Air Force Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80840

Sanford Newell
Department of Modern Languages
Converse College
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29301

Sister M. Norbert, O.P.
Department of French, German
and Spanish
Aquinas College
Grand Rapids, Michigan 59506

Martin Roeder
Vice President for Academic
Affairs
The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Gordon R. Silber
Department of Modern Languages
and Literatures
New York State University
at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14214

Wilmarth H. Starr
All-University Department of
Romance Languages & Literatures
New York University
239 Greene Street
New York, New York 10003

D. H. Walther
Department of Modern Languages
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Homer C. Welsh
Department of Modern Languages
Pennsylvania State College
Kutztown, Pennsylvania 19530

APPENDIX B

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

OUTLINE FOR CHAIRMAN'S DESCRIPTION

I. Brief description of institution

II. Description of foreign language department

A. Enrollment in each language at elementary, second year, advanced, and literary levels

B. In the elementary and second-year language levels

1. Number of contact hours in each course (classroom and language laboratory)

2. Proportion of courses taught by graduate assistants

3. Orientation of these courses

III. Foreign language entrance requirements, if any, for your institution

A. Description

B. When instituted

IV. Description of foreign language preparation of entering students (if available)

A. Percentage of students with 1 year of high school FL study

B. Percentage of students with 2 years of high school FL study

C. Percentage of students with 3 years of high school FL study

D. Percentage of students with 4 or more years of high school FL study

V. Foreign language degree requirements

A. Description

B. When instituted

C. Can they be satisfied by secondary school FL units, including advanced placement

VI. General information on foreign language placement practices. Which of the following do you use and on which do you at present most rely?

A. High school record (rank in class and/or grades in FL courses)

B. Number of years studied FL in high school

C. Performance on language tests

D. Interviews

VII. If students are placed according to number of years of FL studied in high school, how many years make a student eligible for second or third year of college FL? Note: If a test places a student in a lower level course at college than that for which his high school preparation should have qualified him, what credit does he receive upon successful completion of the course?

VIII. Interviews

A. Position of person conducting interviews

B. What kind of information is sought

IX. Placement tests

A. Test used

B. Skills tested

C. If cut-off scores are used, how are they derived

D. To what extent has the department studied the relationship between performance in courses and placement criteria

X. Use of advance placement tests

A. For placement

B. For credit

XI. Time when placement decisions are made (spring preceding entrance; summer; at matriculation)

XII. Provisions for adjustment in placement if student or teacher feels student is misplaced

A. Who decides and on what basis

B. When reconsideration of placement occurs, are there sufficient sections to facilitate transfer

XIII. Description of any changes made in courses or course offerings prompted by a study of FL placement in your institution

APPENDIX C

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN-LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

1. Planning Document: Follow-up Visits by MLA-CEEB Representatives
2. Sample Schedule of Follow-up Visits
3. Interview Guidelines for Follow-up Visits

APPENDIX C

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

1. PLANNING DOCUMENT: FOLLOW-UP VISITS BY MLA AND CEEB REPRESENTATIVES

The follow-up visits which will be made by MLA and CEEB representatives to the campuses of the participating chairmen during March, April, and May 1967 are an integral part of this project. In order to schedule the visits, information is needed from each chairman on what dates are most convenient and approximately how much time will be involved in interviews at each institution.

Please fill in this sheet and hand it to Mrs. Tollinger by the end of Friday's session.

1. Dates for follow-up visit: Please indicate which dates are

   Unavailable:_____

   _____

   Preferable:_____

   _____

2. Number of persons to be interviewed at each campus: Listed below are the categories of persons we feel should be interviewed at each campus. The composition of the categories will vary from institution to institution, and the number of persons involved will depend on the number of languages taught (include only the five commonly taught languages). If you feel that persons not included in the following categories should be contacted at your institution, please indicate their titles under (e) below. List below the number of people involved in each category at your institution and the language(s) for which they are responsible:

   a. Faculty member or administrator in charge of placement in each language:

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

b. Representative of testing service_____

_____

c. Instructors in FL courses other than courses exclusively for freshmen entering with no FL experience (not more than two instructors in each language):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Students who have been placed in FL courses (not more than three in each language; preferably of different levels of language achievement):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

e. Other:_____

_____

_____

We estimate that the interviewers will spend about one hour with persons in categories (a) and (b), 30 minutes with persons in category (c), and 20 minutes with persons in category (d). If you disagree with any of these estimates, please suggest alternatives below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

NAME OF INSTITUTION:_____

APPENDIX C

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

2. SAMPLE SCHEDULE OF FOLLOW-UP VISITS

* * * * * *

Project Staff: Edward Noyes and Suzanne Tollinger

MLA Appointments: C-104-D Padelford

Monday, April 3

10:00	Alan Galt, Instructor German Department Coordinator of 1st and 2nd-year courses
11:00	Duane Mylerberg, Instructor Romance Languages (Spanish) Coordinator of 1st and 2nd-year courses
12:00-2:00	Lunch: Evergreen Room Professors Christofides and Hanzeli Mr. Renny Greenman of the Bureau of Testing
2:00	Associate Professor Victor Hanzeli Romance Languages (French) Coordinator of 1st and 2nd-year courses *in Mrs. Friedrich's absence Mr. Hanzeli will also discuss Italian
3:00	Associate Professor Herman Meyer German Department Formerly coordinator of 1st and 2nd-year courses

Tuesday, April 4

9:00-9:30	Intermediate French student
9:30-10:00	Sara Hart, French teaching assistant Supervisory TA for 2nd-year courses
10:00-10:30	Keith Sauer, Spanish Predoctoral Associate Supervisory TA for Spanish courses
10:30-11:00	Paul Lamarre, French teaching assistant Supervisory TA for 1st-year courses
11:00-11:30	Intermediate German student

11:30-12:00	Elementary German student
12:00-2:00	Lunch: Evergreen Room Professor Horst Rabura, German Professor Willis Konick, Russian
2:00-2:30	Jack O'Connell, Acting Assistant Professor Romance Languages (French) Teaches experimental course on 1st-year level
2:30-3:00	French literature student
3:00-3:30	Elementary French student
3:30-4:00	Russian student
4:00-4:30	Guido Minerbi, Italian teaching assistant

Wednesday, April 5

9:30-10:00	Intermediate Spanish student
10:00-10:30	Elementary Spanish student

*French is the only language in which students may place in a literature course; therefore we have scheduled appointments only with elementary and intermediate students in the other languages.

*Since actual placement examinations are not given in Italian, we have not scheduled any appointments with Italian students.

APPENDIX C

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

3. INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

a. Students

1) Beginning

2) Intermediate

3) Advanced

b. Person Responsible for FL Placement

c. Instructors

1) Beginning

2) Intermediate

3) Advanced--Literature

STUDENTS

(Beginning)

1. Where did you prepare for college: type, size, and location of high school?

2. How many years of this FL did you take?
   Have you taken more than one FL?
   If you changed, why?

3. Did you take any standardized FL tests in high school? Which ones?

4. How well do you think you were prepared for the kind of FL work you are meeting here?

   a. Approach (audio-lingual versus traditional)

   b. Level of difficulty

   c. Amount of preparation per class hour

   d. Experience with language laboratory

   e. Kind and amount of written work in school as compared to what you find here

   f. Use of FL spoken in class

5. Have you been shifted from the course in which you were originally placed? If so, did this disrupt your schedule?

6. How well do you think you are doing in your FL course?

7. Why are you taking this course?

STUDENTS

(Intermediate)

1. Where did you prepare for college: type, size, and location of high school?

2. How many years of this FL did you take?
   Have you taken more than one FL?
   If you changed, why?

3. Did you take any standardized FL tests in high school? Which ones?

4. How well do you think you were prepared for the kind of FL work you are meeting here?

   a. Approach (audio-lingual versus traditional)

   b. Level of difficulty

   c. Amount of preparation per class hour

   d. Experience with language laboratory

   e. Kind and amount of written work in school as compared to what you find here

   f. Use of FL spoken in class

5. Have you been shifted from the course in which you were originally placed? If so, did this disrupt your schedule?

6. How well do you think you are doing in your FL course?

7. How do you think your placement in FL study has affected your plans for further FL study?

8. Why are you taking this course?

STUDENTS

(Advanced)

1. Where did you prepare for college: type, size, and location of high school?

2. How many years of this FL did you take?
   Have you taken more than one FL?
   If you changed, why?

3. Did you take any standardized FL tests in high school? Which ones?

4. How well do you think you were prepared for the kind of FL work you are meeting here?

   a. Approach (audio-lingual versus traditional)

   b. Level of difficulty

   c. Amount of preparation per class hour

   d. Experience with language laboratory

   e. Kind and amount of written work in school as compared to what you find here

   f. Use of FL spoken in class

5. Have you been shifted from the course in which you were originally placed? If so, did this disrupt your schedule?

6. If you were placed at an advanced level, were you able to elect the course you are taking?

7. If you did elect your course, why did you choose the one you did?

8. How do you think your placement in FL study has affected your plans for further FL study?

PERSONS IN CHARGE OF PLACEMENT

1. What courses are offered to entering students who enter with experience in an FL?

   a. Can they be put into courses with students who have had no previous experience in the FL?

   b. Can they place into a literature course?

2. What is the approach of your elementary and intermediate FL courses: mainly audio-lingual or mainly traditional?

   a. Is this the approach compatible with the experience which the majority of entering students have had?

   b. Is any effort made to determine what the FL orientation of incoming students has been?

   c. Do you have any course which can prepare an incoming student who has had an approach different from the one used in your institution to take an intermediate course?

3. Do you have enough courses for effective placement at all levels?

4. How do you place students: high school FL grades, tests, years of FL in high school?

   a. If you consider high school records or FL experience, are you familiar with the principal high schools which send students to your school?

   b. If you equate so many years of high school FL experience with so many years of college FL experience, how did you arrive at this equation? Does it work?

   c. Does your institution or department have any program for encouraging communication between local high schools and your institution?

   d. If you are using tests, what tests are you using, and why? Do you use the results of tests from other than standardized tests administered by the college?

   e. If a test places a student at a lower level than his high school experience qualifies him for, can he elect to take an easier course? Does he get credit for it?

5. Have there been any recent changes in courses or sections to adapt them better to the FL competence of the students?

6. How do you determine if your placement practices are successful?

7. Do you have any suggestions or plans for changes in your placement practices?

8. What is your greatest problem in FL placement?

9. What would help you most in a handbook such as ours?

10. What services from MLA, CEEB, and similar institutions would be helpful to you in your placement program?

INSTRUCTORS

(Beginning)

1. How long have you taught here?

2. Did you receive any specific instruction here on how to teach college FL courses?

3. What courses do you teach?

   a. What level?

   b. How many sections?

   c. How many students in each?

   d. What college year are the students in?

   e. What is the approach of each course (mainly audio-lingual; mainly traditional)?

4. What sort of students do you have?

   a. Are they homogeneously grouped according to FL competence?

   b. Have you a combination of novice students and those who had FL in high school but were deemed not ready for the next level?

   c. Proportion of these groups: Effect of mixture--if there is one--on class work and morale?

   d. If non-novices don't get credit for beginning course, is their performance or morale affected?

   e. If there are different sections for novices and those with previous FL experience, are they taught in the same or different ways?

      1) Are they expected to end the term or year at the same level? Do they?

      2) Is there any effort to bring the non-novice along far enough to by-pass the next course?

      3) In your opinion, could these non-novices have done adequate work in a course or section halfway between elementary and intermediate courses?

   f. What is the orientation of the course which the majority of your students have taken in high school: audio-lingual or traditional?

What effect does a change of approach from high school to college courses have on the students?

g. Has a significant number of your students had experience in the FL outside of high school courses (travel included)?

5. Placement procedure: What information do you have in advance about your students:

a. Information about:

1) Individuals?

2) Groups?

b. Type of information:

1) Test scores?

2) High school FL records?

3) Audio-lingual versus traditional background?

4) Interviews?

c. What do you do with this information?

6. If you find a student is misplaced, what procedure is there for shifting him?

a. When does the system allow the student to shift?

b. In your opinion, is this too early or too late?

c. Are there enough levels to allow most students to be re-placed in the proper course?

d. Is there any follow-up?

1) By whom?

2) Students who have been shifted--success or failure?

3) How much shifting is normally done from your sections?

7. How have you formed your impression of FL learning in the schools?

8. Is there any attempt to get together for discussion all faculty interested in FL placement?

9. What services from MLA, CEEB, and similar institutions would be helpful in your placement program?

INSTRUCTORS

(Intermediate)

1. How long have you taught here?

2. Did you receive any specific instructions here on how to teach college FL courses?

3. What courses do you teach?

   a. What level?

   b. How many sections?

   c. How many students in each?

   d. What college year are the students in?

   e. What is the approach of each course (mainly audio-lingual? mainly traditional?)

4. What sort of students do you have?

   a. Are they homogeneously grouped according to FL competence?

   b. How do students placed directly in your intermediate sections as freshmen compare with sophomores who began here as freshmen? Do you need to make allowances for maturity or acclimation?

   c. Proportion of groups with different degrees of preparation: effect of mixture--if there is one--on class work and morale?

   d. What is the orientation of the courses which the majority of your students have taken in high school; audio-lingual or traditional?

      What effect does a change of approach from high school to college courses have on the students?

   e. Has a significant number of your students had experience in the FL outside of high school courses (travel included)?

5. Placement procedure: What information do you have in advance about your students?

   a. Information about:

      1) Individuals?

      2) Groups?

b. Type of information:

1) Test scores?

2) High school FL records?

3) Audio-lingual versus traditional backgrounds?

4) Interviews?

c. What do you do with this information?

6. If you find a student is misplaced, what procedure is there for shifting him?

a. When does the system allow the student to shift?

b. In your opinion, is this too early or too late?

c. Are there enough levels to allow most students to be re-placed in the proper course?

d. Is there any follow-up?

1) By whom?

2) Students who have been shifted--success or failure?

3) How much shifting is normally done from your sections?

7. How have you formed your impression of FL learning in the schools?

8. Is there any attempt to get together for discussion all faculty interested in FL placement?

INSTRUCTORS

(Literature)

1. How long have you taught here?

2. Did you receive any specific instructions here on how to teach college FL courses?

3. What courses do you teach?

   a. What level?

   b. How many sections?

   c. How many students in each?

   d. What college year are the students in?

   e. What is the approach of each course (mainly audio-lingual? mainly traditional?)

4. What sort of students do you have?

   a. Are they homogeneously grouped according to FL competence?

   b. Can students read literary works?

   c. Can they discuss and write in the FL?

   d. Proportion of groups with different degrees of preparation: effect of mixture--if there is one--on class work and morale?

   e. What is the orientation of the courses which the majority of your students have taken in high school: audio-lingual or traditional?

      What effect does a change of approach from high school to college courses have on the students?

   f. Has a significant number of your students had experience in the FL outside of high school courses (travel included)?

5. Placement procedure: What information do you have in advance about your students:

   a. Information about:

      1) Individuals?

      2) Groups?

b. Type of information:

1) Test scores?

2) High school FL records?

3) Audio-lingual versus traditional backgrounds?

4) Interviews?

c. What do you do with this information?

6. If you find a student is misplaced, what procedure is there for shifting him?

a. When does the system allow the student to shift?

b. In your opinion, is this too early or too late?

c. Are there enough levels to allow most students to be re-placed in the proper course?

d. Is there any follow-up?

1) By whom?

2) Students who have been shifted--success or failure?

3) How much shifting is normally done from your sections?

4) If one of your literature students has been misplaced, does anyone know if he continues FL study?

7. How have you formed your impression of FL learning in the schools?

8. Is there any attempt to get together for discussion all faculty members interested in FL placement?

APPENDIX D

MLA HANDBOOK ON COLLEGE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PLACEMENT

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AND POSITION PAPERS

1. Recommended Standards of Foreign Language Instruction, Michigan Department of Education

2. Foreign Language Articulation in California Schools and Colleges, California State Department of Education

3. Coordination of Foreign Language Programs, Connecticut State Department of Education

4. Address, D.R. Greenham, Ohio Conference on Articulation, Walsh College, October 1, 1966.

recommended standards

of

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

INSTRUCTION

State Board of Education

	Term Expires
DR. EDWIN L. NOVAK, *President*	
Flint	Jan. 1. 1973
MISS MARILYN JEAN KELLY, *Vice President*	
Detroit	Jan. 1. 1969
DR. PETER OPPEWALL, *Secretary*	
Grand Rapids	Jan. 1. 1971
CARMEN DELLIQUADRI, *Treasurer*	
Houghton	Jan. 1. 1969
DR. LEROY G. AUGENSTEIN	
Holt	Jan. 1. 1975
THOMAS J. BRENNAN	
Dearborn	Jan. 1. 1971
DR. CHARLES E. MORTON	
Detroit	Jan. 1. 1973
JAMES F. O'NEIL	
Livonia	Jan. 1. 1975

DR. IRA POLLEY, *State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Chairman*
Member, Ex-Officio

GEORGE ROMNEY, *Governor*
Member, Ex-Officio

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Lansing, Michigan

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

Kindergarten Through Higher Education
by
Representatives of the Foreign Language Profession in the State of Michigan

PREFACE

On October 28, 1966, a series of meetings began which led to the following document. The first meeting was held in conjunction with the Third Annual Michigan Foreign Language Association meeting. The group was composed of representatives of administration and foreign language teaching staffs of Michigan colleges and universities. This group had as its objective the construction of a document which would express the concerns of college and university people regarding the problems which the high school graduate meets as he continues his study of foreign language at the higher education level. This group concentrated only on the discussion of how the university-oriented problems might be solved.

On April 17, 1967, a similar meeting to the above was called at Seaholm High School in Birmingham, Michigan. At this meeting secondary people met to attack the problems of articulation from the vantage point of the secondary teachers and administrators. As a result of this meeting a document was formulated with the objective of establishing recommended solutions at the secondary level.

On October 27, 1967, on the campus of Michigan State University, groups from both higher education and secondary schools (both public and private) met together in an attempt to fuse the two documents into one K-University document which might be used as guidelines for the solution to the problem of articulation.

The above description of the process taken toward the development of the enclosed document is the result of the work of many people in the field working constantly with problems of foreign language teachers. There was no attempt on the part of the Department of Education to dictate the construction of this document. The role of the Foreign Language Consultant was only to provide the opportunity for communication. As a result of this, it must be perfectly clear that this document must not be interpreted as any type of a policy statement on the part of the Department of Education not will there be any attempt on the part of the Department of Education to enforce any of these suggestions. The enclosed document is the voice of the profession of which all foreign language teachers and administrators are a part.

Many of the comments received during the process of developing this document expressed many practical obstacles to the implementation of some of these suggestions. Many small schools, for example, would find it difficult, if not impossible, to offer four years of a language. These practicalities, naturally, have to be taken into consideration as the guidelines are applied. We would hope that teachers and administrators would use this document as a statement of the ideal, recognizing that unavoidable conditions may sometimes make implementation of the ideal impossible.

Definition of Standards

It is recommended that in all language instruction throughout the State the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing, be taught. The following represents a suggested description of competence by levels of language instruction:

Level No. I

Demonstrate control of the whole sound system in listening and in speaking.

Repeat the account of a brief incident as he hears it read, phrase by phrase.

Retell aloud such an incident after repeating it in this way.

Participate with a fluent speaker in a dialogue about any one of perhaps 20 situations.

Write a familiar text from dictation.

Read aloud a familiar text.

Rewrite a simple narrative containing familiar material, making simple changes in tense.

Do orally and in writing exercises that involve a limited manipulation of numbers, gender, word order, tense, replacement, negation, interrogation, command, comparison, and possession.

Become acquainted with culture highlights of the country.

Level No. II

Demonstrate continued accurate control of the sound system.

Recognize all of the basic syntactic patterns of speech and use most of them.

Comprehend, by listening and also by reading, subject matter that is comparable in content and difficulty to what he has learned.

Be able to write all that he can say.

Be able to read brief cultural texts and selections of contemporary literary prose and be able to converse in simple terms about them.

Level No. III

Demonstrate continued accurate control of the sound system.

Demonstrate accurate control, in listening and in speaking, of all the basic syntactic patterns of speech.

Read aloud a text comparable in content and style to one he has studied.

Demonstrate the ability to comprehend a variety of texts prepared for comprehension by ear.

Write from dictation a text he has previously examined for the details of its written forms.

Demonstrate adequate comprehension and control of all but low-frequency patterns of syntax and unusual vocabulary encountered in printed texts. (Grammatical analysis and explanations of structure, when accomplished in the language, are proper to this level and to the following levels.)

Have firsthand knowledge of 100 to 200 pages of readings of a cultural and literary nature; be able to discuss their contents orally and to write acceptable sentences and paragraphs about their contents.

Level No. IV

Read aloud an unfamiliar printed text.

Write from dictation -- (a) following a preliminary reading and (b) without a preliminary reading -- passages of literary prose.

Converse with a fluent speaker on a topic such as a play seen, a novel read, a trip taken, or a residence lived in.

Read a text; then in writing (a) summarize its contents and (b) comment on the ideas expressed.

In a page or two of text, carefully selected for the purpose, discover and comment upon a stated number of points that are culturally significant. These may be in linquistic structure, in idiom, or in vocabulary reference, e.g., if English were the language being learned, a text about the United States in which the term "night school" appears.

Receive oral instructions about an assignment to be written: its nature, its contents, to whom addressed, its form, its length, and its style of presentation, and then write the assignment.

NOTE: It is understood that junior high, high schools, and colleges would not take the same amount of time to finish a level. All levels of instruction should define the time required to complete a level so that the student can progress to the next level whether in high school or at a university. Experience in a foreign language should be expressed in terms of levels of accomplishment as well as years of work.

SECONDARY EDUCATION DOCUMENT

Curriculum

We Recommend --

1. That each Board of Education adopt a philosophy of foreign language education written in cooperation with its foreign language staff.

2. That teachers follow the stated foreign language philosophy and curriculum as instituted by their school district.

3. That secondary and FLES teachers stress the four fundamental skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. These skills should be taught in that order.

4. That the target language be used predominantly in teaching at all levels of foreign language instruction.

5. That class sizes be appropriate to attainment of skill objectives of the class (i.e., team teaching, individualized instruction, modular scheduling, etc.)

Articulation

6. That a track system be used to prevent problems in articulation.

7. That in establishing a foreign language program, districts avoid gaps in the program. They should begin with a senior high program and work backwards. For instance: establish first a solid 12-11-10 program and then institute foreign language in grade 9, then grade 8, etc., rather than begin one program at grade 6, another at grade 9, then skip to grade 11.

8. That the beginning stages of the first foreign language be offered as early as possible. At the latest, the sequence

should begin at the junior high level. This would enable the colleges to strengthen the oral skills and expand into such areas as literature, civilization, and the humanities in the foreign language because the student would have five or six years of preparation. The second, third or fourth language could begin at the university level.

9. That all school systems offer four years of one foreign language rather than two years of two languages if all other contributing factors make this possible.

10. That regular meetings to promote articulation be held within each department, between schools in a given district, and between districts and colleges and universities.

11. That high school foreign language teachers evaluate their students at the end of their senior year and communicate test scores, interviews, and especially ancedotal records to the colleges to aid in the placement of their students at the college level.

Inservice Training and Preparation of Teachers

1. That all foreign language teachers should do some inservice training regardless of teaching experience. Boards of education recognize this need for continued practice to maintain a certain skill and proficiency in a language. Arrangements for pay, released time, mileage, and pay for speakers for workshops be granted. Whenever possible, college credit be given for this type of work.

2. That workshops be organized on a local level. The state provide some assistance if more than one school district is involved. Programs be printed and reports of the meeting sent to the officials of the school. These workshops be organized in the most convenient manner for the area.

3. That a survey of problem areas for foreign language teachers be taken in school districts in order to plan more effective inservice training and workshops.

4. That a foreign language consultant list (to include university, secondary and FLES teachers, as well as other qualified persons) be made available to all school districts for the purpose of helping organize workshops or inservice training sessions.

5. That a televised inservice program be implemented on a statewide basis.

6. That the M.E.A. regional meetings be seriously re-evaluated and that foreign language teachers be involved in instituting more meaningful programs.

New Teachers and Hiring Procedures

7. That every school foreign language department hold a fall orientation workshop for beginning foreign language teachers or teachers who are new to the schools. Specifics would be discussed and suggestions offered by experienced teachers.

8. That a "buddy system" (one experienced teacher and one beginning teacher) be instituted in each foreign language department. This would provide year-long help for the inexperienced teacher.

9. That teachers establish professional libraries in their schools, perhaps keeping in mind that much of this type of material can be made available through federal funds.

10. That the hiring agent of each school district be assured of the oral proficiency of foreign language candidates for positions (either by test scores or by interviews in the language) and that, whenever possible, the department head should be present during the interview.

Communication and Problem Solving

1. That each school district, whenever possible, or several districts combined appoint a foreign language coordinator.

The coordinator should have administrative authority concerning foreign language curriculum problems and the hiring of teachers.

2. That the role of the foreign language department chairman be recognized as a supervisory position with a separate salary schedule and that this person teach fewer classes (e.g., one class less for each five teachers supervised).

3. That, whenever possible, foreign language counseling be done by a counselor with a foreign language background.

4. That the foreign language departments make one formal presentation per semester to counselors to keep them informed of foreign language positions, objectives, and problems.

5. That the notes of foreign language meetings be sent to principals and counselors to keep them abreast of developments in the department.

6. That a letter be sent to all parents explaining the aims and methods of operation of the foreign language program prior to the enrollment of their children in the program for the first time.

7. That a program of intervisitation be encouraged by teachers of all levels: FLES, junior high, high school, college and university and that time be granted for this.

HIGHER EDUCATION DOCUMENT

Placement Tests

We Recommend --

That all colleges and universities adopt some nationally standardized test. At the present time, the CEEB Placement Examination is being used by some Michigan universities and it is recommended that this examination be chosen in order that eventually uniform standards be established throughout the State. It is understood that should a better examination become available, the one in current use could be changed.

The results of the university placement examination should be made available to high schools that are interested in learning how their students have measured up.

It is recommended that no student be given credit at the university level for repeating the material which he has had in high school.

Teacher Preparation

That we subscribe to the Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in the modern foreign languages as recommended by the National Association of Supervisors of Teacher Education and Certification, and outlined on page 342 ff. of the Modern Language Journal for October, 1966.

That all colleges and universities engaged in language teacher training move in the direction of giving the MLA proficiency test for foreign language teachers to all candidates for certification and that the scores be made a part of the student's credentials and that administrators of employing institutions be acquainted with the meaning of these scores.

That in order to assist experienced teachers in improving their skills and to aid in coordinating the work done in the secondary schools with that of the college and university level:

1. Workshops and inservice training institutes should be organized and offered regularly in all parts of the State.
2. Where possible, colleges and universities should set up evening and Saturday courses in language programs and language teaching methodology, offering graduate credit in order that teachers in the field may have the opportunity for further study.
3. In each area steps should be taken to encourage interchange of teachers at each level. Opportunities should be provided for high school teachers to visit and take in college language classes and for college teachers to visit and participate in high school language instruction in order that each group may better understand the problems of the other.
4. In each area, meetings between teachers of secondary language programs and college and university programs should be arranged in order that mutual problems may be discussed and difficulties ironed out.
5. An effort should be made in all colleges and universities to have methods courses taught by persons competent in the language, familiar with public school teaching, and to have a separate methods course for each language.

Foreign Language Articulation in California Schools and Colleges

Policy Recommendations
of the
Liaison Committee on Foreign Language

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Sacramento 1966

The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language is a statewide committee representing all segments of public education in California, from elementary school through graduate school. The Committee was established in 1963 by the Articulation Conference.

OFFICERS—1965–66

Chairman: Roger C. Anton, Head, Foreign Language Department, San Bernardino Valley College

Secretary: Edmond E. Masson, University of California, Santa Barbara

OFFICERS—1964–65

Chairman: Joseph Axelrod, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, San Francisco State College

Secretary: Roger C. Anton, Head, Foreign Language Department, San Bernardino Valley College

OFFICERS—1963–64

Chairman: Kai-yu Hsu, Head, Department of Foreign Language, San Francisco State College

Secretary: Joseph Axelrod, Dean, School of Humanities and Fine Arts, California State College at Palos Verdes

FOREWORD

Within the last 20 years, members of the teaching profession have developed new techniques and new machinery to make the learning of a second language more effective. Progress, however, is not entirely a blessing; it shows up a major problem: articulation. This became apparent with the introduction of foreign language study in the elementary schools of California and the intensification of the study of foreign languages, particularly non-Western languages and cultures, in high schools and colleges.

Basic to the solution of the problem is the adoption of a common overall plan for foreign language training. One such plan is suggested by the State Department of Education's publication, *Language Instruction: Perspective and Prospectus.* The recommendations made in it are part of the process by which the state of California is creatively solving the problem of articulation.

It is a pleasure to see that common goals are being sought by such various statewide groups as the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, which represents all segments of public education in California from kindergarten to graduate school; the Foreign Language Association of Northern California; the Modern Language Association of Southern California; and the State Department of Education. It is to be hoped that through increasing our efforts, the articulation problem in foreign language instruction will be solved in the foreseeable future.

Max Rafferty

Superintendent of Public Instruction

2—72351

Preface

In the spring of 1963, the Articulation Conference brought into existence the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, charging it with the responsibility of recommending solutions to a number of articulation problems in foreign language. The Committee consisted of 24 persons, six each from the University of California, the state colleges, the junior colleges, and the high schools. Later, elementary school representatives were asked to join the Committee; they were appointed at the autumn, 1965, meeting.

For those individuals who are not familiar with the Articulation Conference, it can be described as a voluntary agency composed of four segments of California public education—the high schools, the junior colleges, the state colleges, and the university. This agency, which came into being over 45 years ago, has been meeting at least once annually for the general exploration of problems of common interest as well as for the adoption of resolutions and recommendations on specific issues of articulation. To explore particular problems of articulation, the Articulation Conference set up the statewide Liaison Committee on Foreign Language.

The Committee began its work by analyzing the various aspects of the total articulation problem in foreign language instruction in California; once these aspects were formulated, subcommittees were set up to work on them. After working two years, six subcommittees submitted their reports, together with recommendations, to the full Committee. These were then discussed and revised.

The report presented here summarizes the various subcommittees' recommendations after they were revised by the full Committee discussions. The

report was submitted to the Administrative Committee of the Articulation Conference on December 2, 1965. The chairman of the Liaison Committee, in submitting the report, requested permission to publish and disseminate it. The Administrative Committee voiced the opinion that it would be profitable to disseminate this report and to invite reactions and responses from educators.

The Committee extends its thanks to Max Rafferty and his staff, particularly Frank Largent, Chief of the Bureau of National Defense Education Act Administration.

The Committee wishes also to thank Joseph Axelrod, its 1964–65 chairman, and Roger C. Anton, its 1965–66 chairman, for preparing the several drafts of this report.

THE LIAISON COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE

CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		iii
PREFACE		v
A New Era in the Teaching and Learning of Foreign Languages		1
Fundamental Factors in Solving Articulation Problems		2
Levels of Competence: Key Concept in Curriculum Building and Placement of Students		3
The Credit-Hour Structure in Colleges: A Primary Source of Articulation Problems in the Language Field		5
Junior College Language Offerings Beyond the Fourth-Semester Course		6
College and University Programs for Foreign Language Teaching Majors		7
The Problem of Imbalance in Language Offerings		9
Effective Communication Among Schools and Colleges About Language Problems and Policies		10
APPENDIX A	Description of Competence by Levels	11
APPENDIX B	Members of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language—1965–66	15
APPENDIX C	Former Members of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language	17

A New Era in the Teaching and Learning of Foreign Languages

In the mid-1950s, a new era began in the teaching and learning of modern foreign languages in this country. Among the basic changes was the change in public attitudes toward the importance of language study. In addition, new methods of teaching were being explored, language study on the secondary school level was expanding rapidly, and there was a strong movement toward language study in the elementary schools. Finally, with the growing emphasis on non-Western studies, language study programs were expanding everywhere to include more than the commonly taught languages spoken in Western Europe and in Latin America.

These changes pointed up articulation problems in the foreign language field. The problems themselves were not new. However, because both enrollments and programs had increased, such problems became acute. Changes were occurring everywhere, but sometimes more slowly in one place than in another and in different directions at different places.

The result was inevitable: articulation points became sore points. Elementary pupils who had had some instruction in language moved to the secondary level to find, very often, that their language study was ignored. As more and more high school students progressed to college, innumerable placement problems arose in language programs because some students had been taught by traditional methods and others by more modern methods. Junior colleges began to find their students ready to move beyond the fourth-semester course after they had completed only one or two semesters.

In the early 1960s, a serious curriculum gap was evident in the preparation of language teachers. The teacher-training programs of the late 1950s had lagged behind the times. The students who completed language programs for a bachelor's degree were well trained in many ways, but very often they were not proficient enough in the spoken language to meet the new demands being made on language teachers. In the late 1950s, only the teachers completing the exceptional teacher-training programs could qualify as "excellent," according to criteria then being developed by the Modern Language Association of America (MLA). By now, many more are able to attain "excellent" ratings on all seven parts of the new tests devised at MLA headquarters: listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, culture, linguistics, and methodology. However, the profession still faces an enormous problem in its continuing attempt to improve language teacher preparation.

Fundamental Factors in Solving Articulation Problems

In the view of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, the normal problems of articulation in the schools and colleges of California *can* be solved in the foreseeable future.

The ultimate solutions to articulation problems depend on two fundamental factors: First of all, California schools and colleges must adopt common objectives in the teaching and learning of foreign languages; and second, there must be acceptance of a curricular continuum which would serve as the basic guideline for language instruction from the earliest level of study through the teacher-training program.

The first of these tasks—adoption of common objectives—has already been considerably facilitated. Acceptable objectives for the first four levels of language instruction have been formulated in *Language Instruction: Perspective and Prospectus*, a California State Department of Education publication. (See Appendix A.)

The principles of audiolingual instruction for teaching listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing are approved by professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association of America, the Department of Foreign Language of the National Education Association, the California State Department of Education, the California Council of Foreign Language Teachers Associations, the Modern Language Association of Southern California, and the Foreign Language Association of Northern California. The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language endorses the policy announcements made by these organizations.

Levels of Competence: Key Concept in Curriculum Building and Placement of Students

Within the framework that the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language finds most fruitful for discussions regarding articulation problems, "level" refers to *level of linguistic proficiency*, not to the amount of time that a student has devoted to language study. Attempts to equate given levels of proficiency with given numbers of semesters or quarters of study remain purely artificial. The major criterion to be used in determining where a student is to be placed, as he moves from one institution to another and as he continues his study in a given language, is the level of competence he has attained

in listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing.

From this general principle, it follows that scores on proficiency tests should constitute the means for placing students in foreign language courses in California colleges and universities. For modern languages, it is obvious that the tests should measure all four skills. Further, the Committee recommends the use of professionally designed tests for which national norms have been established instead of locally constructed instruments.

The case is clear: The object of a placement program is to place an entering student at the level for which he is linguistically prepared, whatever his training has been. Scores on placement tests should therefore be used to determine the level at which the student will be placed. Other criteria should not be used except in borderline cases. Moreover, in order to establish local norms, these professionally designed instruments should be used to test continuing students as well as entering students.

The Liaison Committee recognizes that when large groups of students are to be tested, difficulties exist in the administration of speaking and listening-comprehension tests and in the scoring of the speaking test. More efficient and economical methods of administering and scoring these tests for large groups must be found, and the Committee urges immediate support for such an investigation. At the same time, however, it does not feel that the magnitude of the problem justifies limiting the scope of placement tests to exercises in reading and writing or in translation. This practice is now followed in a number of language departments on California campuses.

The Committee urges that high school students be advised to continue in college the language they

studied in elementary and high schools. A college preparatory student should have *at least* four years of study in a single language as he approaches graduation from high school. Again, a statement in terms of time is not as significant as a statement about competence in the language. Different school systems may wish to implement the principle in different ways, but the principle here is indisputable: The sequence of study in a single language should be long enough to enable the student to reach a level of usable proficiency—that is, the proficiency described in Level III, as quoted in Appendix A.

The Credit-Hour Structure in Colleges: A Primary Source of Articulation Problems in the Language Field

Although a few institutions of higher education in California no longer award undergraduate degrees merely on the basis of accumulated credit hours, the Committee recognizes that the credit-hour system is still prevalent in California higher education. The practice of setting a language requirement for a degree in terms of credit hours—or of setting a requirement for entrance to college in terms of high school semesters of study—will probably remain fairly common as long as the accumulation of credit hours remains the primary mode of earning a degree. This is the source of many of the problems of language articulation between high school and college. For example, if a placement test score indicates that an entering college student must "repeat" study for which his high school transcript shows he has already received "credit," then the problem immediately arises on most campuses as to whether such study should be permitted to count to-

ward the credit hours the student accumulates to qualify for a bachelor's degree.

The Committee believes the solution to such problems must be determined by the individual institution. However, it recommends as a general principle that no college credit be granted for "duplication" of work for which the student holds high school credit. At the same time, it recommends also that each college and university should use its system of rewards—whether through credit hours or in other ways—to give recognition to those entering freshmen who have satisfactorily met and surpassed the goals described in *Language Instruction: Perspective and Prospectus*. (See Appendix A.)

Junior College Language Offerings Beyond the Fourth-Semester Course

Since students are now completing high school programs with more advanced training in foreign languages than they have had in the past, California junior colleges today are presented with a special problem: What sorts of language courses should they offer to students who have already had the equivalent of four college semesters in a foreign language?

The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language recommends that junior colleges expand their foreign language offerings beyond the customary second-year college course. It would be best, of course, if these offerings were not patterned after upper division college or university courses. Additional work on the lower division level can be offered in more advanced courses in conversation and composition, in a course on civilization and culture, in introduction to literature courses, in readings of literary works or scientific papers, in introductory linguistics, and in similar aspects of language work. Such courses should be taught in the foreign language. They should be fully transferable.

College and University Programs for Foreign Language Teaching Majors

The most critical problems of articulation center ultimately in the training which prospective foreign language teachers receive in California's colleges and universities. The Committee wishes to present here its recommendations on programs for foreign language teaching credential majors. Such other aspects of the teacher-training problem as inservice training for elementary and high school teachers who are now or are soon to be involved in teaching a language are still under study by the Committee.

First of all, foreign language teaching majors must learn to understand, speak, read, and write the language they will be teaching. While there are other skills, abilities, and kinds of knowledge which the language teacher ought to have, competence in the four skills must be of central concern to the teacher-training institution, the certifying agency, and the employing district.

The Liaison Committee, therefore, supports the pronouncements of the professional organizations in the language field which urge that maximal use of the foreign language be made in all college courses —whether courses in language, in culture, in literary study, or in linguistics.

The Committee wishes to emphasize, however, that while proficiency in listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing is absolutely essential, it is clearly only one of several major goals of a foreign language teacher-preparation program.

The prospective teacher must also acquire the knowledge in several major disciplines which is appropriate to the tasks he will be facing in the classroom—knowledge relating to educational psychology, to the study of culture in general and of literature in particular, and to linguistic science. Moreover, he must have training in methodology to help him, as he begins to work in the classroom, to acquire the *art* of teaching.

Degree programs in foreign language studies at the state colleges, at the University of California, and at the private teacher-preparation institutions in California often have, understandably, purposes other than the preparation of language teachers. As a consequence, a prospective language teacher who completes his work for a degree may be well versed in one of the several relevant disciplines but may nevertheless not be prepared for the demands of a teaching post.

The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, therefore, joins the Modern Language Association and other professional organizations in the field of language study in suggesting that no graduate of a teacher-training program—whatever the level of his formal course work—be certified for language teaching unless he can demonstrate that he has reached respectable levels of skill and knowledge in listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, culture, linguistics, and the art and science of teaching, as measured by such instruments as the MLA tests for advanced students and teachers. The most recent MLA statement regarding foreign language teacher preparation programs appears in *The Education of the Modern Foreign Language Teacher for American Schools* by Joseph Axelrod (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1966).

The Problem of Imbalance in Language Offerings

While the Liaison Committee understands the circumstances which explain the imbalance that has developed in foreign language offerings in California schools, it wishes to recommend the following as a *basic goal* toward which all schools should work: a minimum of two modern foreign languages at the elementary level, and a minimum of three modern foreign languages and one classical language at the high school level.

Along with this recommendation, the Committee wishes to caution against instituting foreign language programs without planning for continuity in the languages selected—a continuity which should begin before grade six and run through the final year of the high school.

The Liaison Committee recognizes that the particular languages taught in a given school district are chosen at the discretion of the district. But it urges that cognizance be given not only to the linguistic background of students and to the historical interests of local communities but also to the broader purposes of general education. To satisfy these purposes, multilanguage programs at all levels of study—going beyond the Western languages whenever possible—are a necessity.

The Committee does not stand alone in these recommendations. The California State Board of Education passed a resolution to this effect on April 9, 1964, and both the Foreign Language Association of Northern California and the Modern Language Association of Southern California have urged continuity of multilanguage programs from the elementary grades through grade twelve.

Effective Communication Among Schools and Colleges About Language Programs and Policies

Ineffective communication among the schools and colleges about their current programs and policies constitutes a most serious block in the articulation process. The Committee, therefore, proposes that a central information center be set up which would use modern automated methods for collecting, processing, and disseminating information to schools and colleges about programs and policies in the language field. The Committee recommends that the State Department of Education be requested to set up and operate such an information center.

APPENDIX A

Description of Competence by Levels [1]

Since competent teachers for second language programs are still in very short supply, we can hardly expect many full-length programs of the proper sort, running from an early grade through grade twelve, to be functioning in the near future. Therefore, we must plan in part in terms of temporary expedients that though they fall short of the ideal are nevertheless improvements on the traditional situation. We shall speak here of different streams and of certain roughly comparable levels of achievement. The quantity of work ascribed to a single level is defined in terms of the amount of learning that can be reasonably expected in a high school class that meets regularly five full periods a week for one school year and operates efficiently. . . .

In any single school system, the materials and procedures for levels III through VI can be identical for all these streams, and students from all streams can even be commingled in a single class, since at the high school level there seems to be no serious difficulty in having students from different grades work together if their preparation is comparable. Levels I and II are another matter. Although the language to be learned is the same regardless of stream, the interests and capacities of eight-year-olds and of twelve-year-olds are different, and materials and procedures must be adjusted accordingly. The attention span of the eight-year-old is

[1] *Language Instruction: Perspective and Prospectus.* Prepared by Nelson Brooks, Charles F. Hockett, and Everett V. O'Rourke. Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Vol. XXXII, No. 4, November, 1963. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1963, pp. 22-26.

comparatively short. A single period of 20 minutes of concentrated purposeful practice once a day, five days a week, throughout grades three to six is ample. About 40 minutes at a time, once a day, five days a week, throughout grades seven and eight are enough for children in the basic stream to master Level II and for children in alternative stream B to master Level I.

	BASIC STREAM		ALTERNATIVE STREAM			
	Stream A		Stream B		Stream C	
Grades	3					
	4	I*				
	5					
	6					
	7	II	7	I		
	8		8			
	9	III	9	II	9	I
	10	IV	10	III	10	II
	11	V	11	IV	11	III
	12	VI	12	V	12	IV

*Roman numerals indicate levels.

These recommendations on time and timing are approximate, not restrictive. . . .

LEVEL I

Demonstrate, in hearing and in speaking, control of the whole sound system.
Repeat the account of a brief incident as he hears it read, phrase by phrase.
Retell aloud such an incident after repeating it in this way.
Participate, with a fluent speaker, in a dialogue about any one of perhaps 20 situations.
Read aloud a familiar text.
Write a familiar text from dictation.
Rewrite a simple narrative containing familiar material, making simple changes in tense.
Do orally and in writing exercises that involve a limited manipulation of number, gender, word order, tense, replacement, negation, interrogation, command, comparison, and possession.

LEVEL II

Demonstrate continued accurate control of the sound system.
Recognize all of the basic syntactic patterns of speech and use most of them.
Comprehend, by listening and also by reading, subject matter that is comparable in content and difficulty to what he has learned.
Be able to write all that he can say.
Have firsthand knowledge of brief samples of cultural and of contemporary literary prose and be able to converse in simple terms about them.

LEVEL III

Demonstrate continued accurate control of the sound system.
Demonstrate accurate control, in hearing and in speaking, of all the basic syntactic patterns of speech.
Read aloud a text comparable in content and style to one he has studied.
Demonstrate the ability to understand what is heard in listening to a variety of texts prepared for comprehension by ear.
Write from dictation a text he has previously examined for the details of its written forms.
Demonstrate adequate comprehension and control of all but low-frequency patterns of syntax and unusual vocabulary encountered in printed texts. (Grammatical analysis and explanations of structure, when accomplished in the language, are proper to this level and to the following levels.)
Have first-hand knowledge of 100 to 200 pages of readings of a cultural and literary nature; be able to discuss their contents orally and to

write acceptable sentences and paragraphs about their contents.

LEVEL IV

Read aloud an unfamiliar printed text.

Write from dictation—(a) following a preliminary reading and (b) without a preliminary reading—passages of literary prose.

Converse with a fluent speaker on a topic such as a play seen, a novel read, a trip taken, or a residence lived in.

Read a text; then in writing (a) summarize its contents and (b) comment on the ideas expressed.

In a page or two of text, carefully selected for the purpose, discover and comment upon a stated number of points that are culturally significant. These may be in linguistic structure, in idiom, or in vocabulary reference, e.g., if English were the language being learned, a text about the United States in which the term "night school" appears.

Receive oral instructions about an assignment to be written: its nature, its contents, to whom addressed, its form, its length, and its style of presentation, and then write the assignment.

APPENDIX B

Members of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language 1965–66

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REPRESENTATIVES

Thomas L. Broadbent, Chairman, Department of German and Russian, Riverside

Donald G. Castanien, Chairman, Department of Spanish, Davis

John E. Englekirk, Professor of Spanish and Portuguese, Los Angeles

Edmond E. Masson, Associate Professor, French and Russian, Santa Barbara

Leonard D. Newmark, Chairman, Department of Linguistics, San Diego

Vern W. Robinson (ex-officio member), Associate Professor of German and Director of Relations with Schools, Los Angeles

STATE COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

Joseph Axelrod, Associate Dean for Academic Planning and Professor of World Literature, San Francisco State College

Clifford H. Baker, Professor of Spanish, San Diego State College

James H. Baltzell, Professor of Foreign Languages, California State College at Long Beach

William O. Cord, Associate Professor, Spanish, Sonoma State College

Gustave Mathieu, Professor, Foreign Languages, California State College at Fullerton

Carlos Rojas, Professor of Foreign Languages and Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, Fresno State College

JUNIOR COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES

Roger C. Anton, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, San Bernardino Valley College
Ruth P. Craig, French Instructor, Santa Rosa Junior College
O. Carl Schulz, German Instructor, Santa Ana College
Alex Turkatte, Department of Foreign Languages, San Joaquin Delta College
John K. Wells, Administrative Assistant, Division of Colleges and Adult Education, Los Angeles City Junior College District

HIGH SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES

Frank Gulick, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, Ventura Union High School District
George V. Hall, Associate Superintendent, San Diego City Unified School District
G. Gilbert Rogers, Secondary Curriculum Consultant, San Luis Obispo County

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES

Donald Boyer, Regional Director, Elementary Division, San Diego City Unified School District
Julia Gonsalves, Consultant, Foreign Languages, State Department of Education

APPENDIX C

Former Members of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language (with dates of service[1])

Arthur L. Askins, Assistant Professor of Spanish and Portuguese, University of California, Berkeley (1964–65)
George Dietterle, Director of Instruction, Monterey Public Schools (1963–65)
Carlo L. Golino, Professor of Italian and Dean, Division of Humanities, University of California, Los Angeles (1963–64)
Wulf Griessbach, Foreign Language Department, Los Angeles State College (1963–65)
Kai-yu Hsu, Head, Department of Foreign Language, San Francisco State College (1963–65)
Claude L. Hulet, Associate Professor of Spanish, University of California, Los Angeles (1964–65)
Martin Kanes, Associate Professor of French, University of California, Davis (1964–65)
Marion L. Nielsen, Chairman, Division of Humanities, Sonoma State College (1963–64)
Arthur North, Assistant Superintendent of Education Service, Azusa Unified School District (1963–64)
Samuel Oelrich, Principal, Fairfax High School, Los Angeles (1963–64)
Everett V. O'Rourke, Consultant, Bureau of Secondary Education, State Department of Education (1963–65)

[1] The positions listed for the members of the Liaison Committee were those held by the individuals for the years indicated but do not necessarily represent current positions.

John H. R. Polt, Assistant Professor of Spanish and Portuguese, University of California, Berkeley (1963–64)

Siegfried B. Puknat, Chairman, German Department, University of California, Davis (1963–65)

Irving Putter, Professor of French, University of California, Berkeley (1963–64)

William A. Reynolds, Departments of English and French, Fresno City College (1963–65)

O. Paul Straubinger, Professor of German, and Vice-Chairman, Division of Humanities, University of California, Riverside (1963–65)

printed in CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING
72351—300 6-66 15M

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
Hartford

With a change in emphasis in foreign language teaching in the public schools from a vague, compartmentalized treatment of language and "Culture" to one of skill development, a most pressing need has come to be a well-coordinated program. Also, colleges are finding differences in the preparation of students sent to them. This is causing both secondary schools and colleges to take a closer look at coordination and communication at this level.

Recognizing the great need for coordination, the Foreign Language Consultant and the Advisory Committee on Foreign Language Instruction of the State Department of Education have prepared the attached paper in hopes of giving some direction to possible solutions. It is hoped that this will be of equal benefit to school administrators, supervisors, foreign language teachers and college personnel.

The writers would like to acknowledge with thanks the thoughtful suggestions made by educators beyond the field of foreign language teaching, including several superintendents of schools, before this final draft of the paper was composed.

Kenneth A. Lester
Foreign Language Consultant

Advisory Committee on Foreign Language Instruction 1965-66 :

Dr. Morton Briggs, Wesleyan University (Chairman)
Miss Lillian S. Adams, Glastonbury
*Mrs. Doris Barry, West Hartford
Dr. Nelson Brooks, Yale University
*Mr. Frederick Burkhardt, Farmington
Mr. Dominic Côté, Branford
Dr. Grace Crawford, Storrs
*Dr. Donald Hook, Trinity College
Rev. Victor J. Leeber, S.J., Fairfield University
Sister Mary Claire, O.P., Albertus Magnus College
Sister Mary Evelyn, St. Joseph College
Miss Dorothy Moynihan, Hamden
Mr. Rudolph Oblom, Greenwich
Dr. Chester Obuchowski, University of Connecticut
Mr. J. Robert Schmitz, Southern Connecticut State College
Dr. Arthur M. Selvi, Central Connecticut State College
*Miss Maureen Shugrue, Torrington
*Mrs. Marie-Louise Werfelman, Wethersfield
Mr. Symond Yavener, Glastonbury

* Members of sub-committee on coordination

Coordination of Foreign Language Programs

Problems

1. A problem of coordination exists in two dimensions. The first dimension, articulation, involves sequential progression from one level of language study to the next, both within a single school and from one school to another. The second dimension relates to correlation between different sections within the same level of study. (The term level is not synonymous with one year of study. A level needs to be defined by the local system, taking into consideration the length of the language sequence, the materials used, the type of pupil studying the language, the number of times per week that classes meet, and the proficiency expected of the student completing the foreign language sequence. See Paragraph 5a.)

2. The basic problem is one of philosophy. A common set of objectives and goals should be implemented by all members of a foreign language staff by means of careful step-by-step planning of a "total" program.

3. There is need for basic understanding of what facets of language learning are part of each level of language instruction.

4. Colleges and universities have little knowledge of what has been covered by the secondary schools in "two, three, or four levels." In other words, there is a lack of communication between secondary schools and colleges and universities. The responsibility for this lack is to be shared by both.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested for partial solution of these problems. Total alleviation of the problems would be impossible unless all educational institutions adopted a common philosophy and methodology. Even then individual differences in teachers, students, and schools might still continue to create some problems of articulation.

1. A basic philosophy of language teaching should be adopted by a school system. Objectives and goals and methods for their attainment should be decided upon by all members of a staff. A staff member or prospective staff member agrees to follow the basic philosophy in accepting employment in the system.

   a. The final adoption of a basic philosophy is the prerogative of the school administration and a school board. The development, however should be by the foreign language staff.

   b. Constant orientation and reorientation are needed for the staff throughout the system and at all levels of instruction.

c. A course of study common to the school system should be provided and followed. A teacher at any given level should be able to expect that students have covered the materials prescribed in the previous levels and have attained a reasonable proficiency.

2. A school system or school with various levels of foreign language instruction is in need of coordination to insure implementation of the basic philosophy. The committee feels that coordination can best be effected under the direction of a single specialist chosen for that purpose.

a. Enough time for adequate coordination should be made available by lessening the class load for anyone with the prime responsibility.

b. Such coordination is best effected through classroom visitation and critique sessions.

3. Method should be consistent during the years when emphasis is essentially on the mastery of the structure of the target language.

4. Common materials throughout the language program should be adopted to meet the goals and objectives of the philosophy. Such materials should be common to both dimensions of coordination.

5. The local school systems should have the primary responsibility of teaching the basic structural patterns of the target language. It is reasonable to assume a three-level program in modern languages and a two-level sequence in Latin as minimum for this phase of study. In modern languages stress on vocabulary study should be minimized until structures have been mastered.

a. The local system has the responsibility of deciding what division of materials is necessary to cover the basic structure of the language in the time allotted.

b. The basic structural stage should include the skills of oral comprehension, pronunciation, speaking, reading, and some writing.

6. Advanced levels of language should be available for election by the student. Such advanced levels should refine the basic skills, place more emphasis on the development of the writing skill, and increase the vocabulary of the students through the study and appreciation of literature.

7. Colleges and universities should expect that basic structure has been mastered in the secondary school. In order to increase the communication between secondary schools and colleges and universities:

a. A more accurate description of what has been covered in the foreign language curriculum of the local school system should be added to the transcript. The notation "two or three or four years" or "two, three, four or five Carnegie units" is not enough.

b. Results of standardized achievement tests in the four skills (for example, the MLA Cooperative Tests) should be forwarded to the colleges.

8. Colleges and universities should maintain and develop all the skills in the target language. This means:

a. All language courses taught in the target language.

b. Other disciplines (history, fine arts, etc.) taught in the target language for language majors.

c. Wider use of tests which evaluate the four basic skills for placement at the college or university level.

9. Basic skills should not only be developed but also eventually sufficiently reinforced by the end of secondary school to enable the language student to pursue courses in more advanced conversation and composition, in literature, in civilization, and in linguistics. Beginning language courses should continue to be offered at the colleges and universities for those desirous of a second (or third) language.

10. Since language study in depth is of such great importance, it is strongly advised that a foreign language program be started as early in the curriculum as local budgets, staffing, and programming permit.

11. It is not the language studied but language study, no matter whether classical or modern, which is important. Every language offered by the school system should be available for election by the student at the beginning of his language experience (except that the practicability of teaching classical languages on the elementary level is questioned). Too stringent limitations of the offerings at the beginning will endanger the continuance of several languages which may already be offered at upper secondary levels. Implications for the whole language program must be considered.

12. Programs of study should be organized so as to make it possible for students who have language ability to elect a second foreign language.

13. Because foreign language learning should be available to all students, it is highly desirable that multi-track offerings in levels of language be considered.

a. A multi-track program means grouping within levels according to ability and achievement.

b. The multi-track program should be organized so as to allow flexibility. By flexibility is meant the ability to move from track to track depending upon the student's achievement. (The distinction in tracks should be made clear in college-admission transcripts.)

c. Effort should be made not to include beginning students in the same track with those who are starting the level again because of a previous failure.

COPY OF TALK DELIVERED TO THE CONFERENCE ON ARTICULATION
AT WALSH COLLEGE, OCTOBER 1, 1966.

D. R. GREENHAM

Dr. Allen, Miss Glenn, Brother Thomas, Mr. Herrmann:
I'm very happy to be here this morning, happy that such a meeting is taking place .

It is with some trepidation that I attempt to speak for my fellow teachers. They may find as much wrong with what I say as may the college people.

At any rate, I feel that nothing but good can come from such meetings.

I should like to begin with a resumé of problems that we have in the high schools. Several of these are not related to the problem of articulation, so I'll mention them just briefly:

1. Class loads are too heavy, not so much in class size, perhaps, but in the number of classes which we teach. There is a consequent lack of time for individual attention.

2. Language laboratory vandalism. There are astonishing amounts of it, and some of it reflects real imagination on the part of the students. The vandalism also reflects, on occasion, a surprising level of electronic sophistication.

3. The problem that once plagued only the colleges...the diversity of preparation of the students in the intermediate classes. Our problem now is the students we receive from the junior high schools with wide differences, not so much in ability, but in ground covered in the beginning classes.

4. The fourth problem affects you in the colleges. The fact of the matter is that since the Conant Report, the drive for third, fourth and fifth levels of language in high schools has been great and too frequently these programs are taught by inadequately prepared teachers. It is not exceptional to find college students with a four-year high school background in one of the spoken languages, unable to carry on meager conversations or comprehend the simplest directions in the target language. This we know from the reports of our former students who tell us of their classmates.

To reiterate, these are the four problems:

1. Too many classes to teach.
2. Laboratory vandalism.
3. Diversity of preparation in intermediate classes.
4. Too many of us who need more work.

Now...let us look at the college situation as we see it. I should say here that the "WE" is spoken in the New Yorker magazine sense...I mean as I see it, for I had no collaboration on this text, and any comments which you may find objectionable are strictly my own.

This is necessarily a negative evaluation that we're going to give, not because the situation is entirely negative, but because time does not permit comments which cover good points of programs.

I want to divide the criticisms into two catagories: those which pertain to college programs which directly affect the public school programs, and those which are the complaints of former students, but which do not directly affect us; these points will overlap some:

Let us begin with the latter group: These are from former students:

QUOTE: "All grammar and explanations are given in English...I don't understand this because we are all language majors."

QUOTE: "Classes are large at my level. I can only recite once or twice during an hour, and then only to answer questions."

QUOTE: "Dr. BLANK is definitely what I would term "lazy." Class meets only when he feels like teaching. From what I can tell, BLANK college does not appear to be challenging its language majors. Although I'm presumably in an advanced course, I'm not required to speak French when addressing the professor. This seems sort of odd to me, and I'm a little worried that I won't be challenged enough."

QUOTE: "We have no opportunities to speak as we did in high school. We certainly will never have the chance here to conduct a class for a whole hour as you allowed us to do. I gained some self confidence conducting our class in high school, and I observed things that I would and would not do when other members of the class taught."

QUOTE: "We have a lunch table in French once a week, but it's a course for which credit is given, and many kids don't want to take it because they worry about the grade and indigestion."

QUOTE: "We have to memorize the stories from the reader. For a test, he takes sentences straight from the reader and leaves some blanks. We must fill in with the exact word from the story, in the same tense, or it's wrong."

QUOTE: "This semester I'm taking a grammar course. It's conducted in French until someone asks a question."

QUOTE: "I'm taking a literature course now, but it's mostly in English."

Except for one of these quotes, these comments were not solicited. They were offered by former students. I simply got out my filed correspondance from the last few years and copied some of these down.

Having given the quotes, I'll be specific in the criticisms:

1. The colleges for the most part have poor placement programs. You people are not careful enough about placing students who enter with foreign language backgrounds. They frequently end up at the wrong levels, either over their heads or in classes which are too simple for them. In the latter case, they seldom complain. They're more than content to sit there and collect an "A" to beef up their grade point average. These students need counseling and guidance within the department, and they need it on an individual basis.

2. Classes are not conducted in the language. Many students find this shocking...many are grateful. What is the solution to this problem? My alma mater, the University of Wisconsin (which Dr. Allen also attended) maintained while I was there, and still maintains, two levels of language in almost every language department. One is traditional, the other conversational. The conversational classes meet twice as often at the beginning level and half again as often at the intermediate level...for the same credit ...as the traditional courses.

You may not like this idea, but ask yourselves...what are we doing for language majors...what are we doing for those who are interested? Better yet, what are we doing to them?

You people have too much developed your programs as a service to the colleges of letters and science, providing language classes for requirements.

Separate these people...separate those who are interested from those who are not. Do something for the majors.

I would like to add here that I have sat in on two graduate French courses at two different schools in the last year that were conducted entirely in English. Graduate courses filled with language majors and not one direction, not one question in French. These courses properly belong in a comparative literature course, and the books might as well be read in translation too.

Students report that college classes are dull....of course they're dull for language majors, who sit in class with everyone else. One of the problems is teaching to the bottom of the class rather than the top. You don't find this in other subject areas, mathematics, chemistry, physics.

I don't think this problem of separation would be as difficult as it sounds...At any rate, no matter what the difficulty, it would be worth it.

3. Next...what are the opportunities outside of class? Where are the coffee hours, the langauge clubs, the movies, the parties, the meals...IN THE LANGUAGE?

Better yet, where are the language houses...with some dorm space for majors and a few scholarships provided to attract native speakers to live in and provide the atmosphere?

Don't say that it can't be done... It's being done at some schools and on a scale unknown around here.

Don't say that only a few would come to parties and coffee hours. If just ten come or five, or even ONE, it's worth the effort to encourage these people. That's what you're there for....

Try inviting your interested advanced students to your home for some coffee and a look at your slides...ALL IN SPANISH... They'll come! Send them to the ART movie theatre in Akron or Cleveland (better check to see what's playing first) to see a foreign movie...talk about it in class...give them Credit if they go.

Don't talk about not having time for these extra things. If you haven't taught high school in the last few years, you don't remember what a full week is.

4. Next: Get something besides traditional literature into the curriculum. Notice I don't say replace it...Just get something else. An art appreciation course...a religion course (where this is appropriate)...a history course...in the foreign language. Literary classics are not for everyone.

Though I don't like to cite personal experiences, it is appropriate to do so here. We are trying something different at Lincoln this year. We are offering, for the first time, American History taught in French. The preparations for this course were almost two years long. It required changes in scheduling, hunting for texts and supplementary readings and other administrative problems. As we selected students to take this course, I allowed a girl whose work in French IV was rather unsatisfactory, to take the course, and I had some misgivings about it. Last year she did not like the sonnets of DuBellay, she did not like the Roman de Renart. She did not like Corneille's Horace nor the Barber of Seville. She did like Mademe Bovary but I think for the wrong reasons. At any rate, she's doing very well in the history class, and I mentioned this to her...she replied, "I've always liked history." As I said, the literary classics aren't for everyone.

5. Right here I would like to say a word about graduate teaching assistants. There are many complaints about them, and perhaps many are justified. However, I'm going to defend them here. They

frequently show more enthusiasm and more concern and put forth more effort into their teaching than many of the people on tenure. Note, that in the quote which I read to you earlier...it was DOCTOR BLANK who was lazy and taught class when he felt like it.

Now, in the other catagory of criticism: Areas which directly affect the public school program.

The principal matter here is teacher preparation.

The college foreign language departments have got to become more involved in teacher preparation. We need more than people who have majored in a language. They must know something about teaching it.

1. I have never seen a student teacher in a foreign language receive a visit during his or her student teaching from any language professor. Who comes? Someone from the education department. I have never known of one of these "someones" from an education department who knew anything about languages.

And according to their evaluation sheets, it's quite easy to get a good grade and know nothing about the langauge. With evaluation points on such things as: 1) smiles enough, 2) seems to show concern for students, 3) looks neat - in class, and 4) is aware of health factors in the room, the plus points in these catagories more than offset the fact that the student may know nothing about his subject.

Lest you misunderstand this, I'm not knocking schools of education. I'm currently involved in a doctoral program in education myself.

My point is that the gulf of animosity that has existed between language and education departments everywhere must be bridged and you people must do it. They have taken over the role of the preparation of teachers because you did not. You must become involved with this. You cannot both complain about the quality of high school teaching and not do something about your own programs for prospective teachers.

You must demand a part in the role of student-teacher supervision. GET OUT AND SEE THESE PEOPLE ON THE JOB...

2. The methods courses...these are frequently a laugh. There have actually been cases where these courses were taught by the education staff rather than the language staff.

But, once again this came about through language departments' unwillingness to become involved in these essentially "science of teaching" courses. Education departments move in where there is a void.

What goes on in the methods courses? I took mine quite late in my career, after I had already been teaching for several years. It had between thirty and forty students and included majors in French, German, Spanish, Russian and Latin. It was a total waste of time, and it wasn't the instructor's fault. No one in the department was

interested in teaching it. No one was demanding that this course be broken into the separate languages. No one was demanding that this course for teachers be made meaningful.

And yet, what happens to us in the high schools?

We get students who can't build a pattern drill...who can't make an oral/aural lesson out of a traditional lesson (and don't say "why should they?" We haven't the luxury of changing books when we want to, and many traditional books are still in use...Incidentally, many traditional books are still in use in the colleges, and for the life of me, I can't figure why).

We get student teachers who have no oral ability...At Wisconsin, besides a major certificate, we had to have an oral proficiency ticket, earned through an oral exam before a committee of three professors. This was somewhat frightening, yes, but it's necessary...and it was required of all teaching majors. There are few schools in Ohio which require this.

3. Where in the college curriculum, are the advanced courses that would provide this needed oral ability? As a senior in college, I took a diction course with three other students and an advanced conversation course with six others.

In addition, we were frequently involved with some teaching in other literature courses. We prepared lessons and conducted class. Why couldn't you allow your students to conduct a class now and then at the advanced levels? Most of us don't speak in such deathless prose that we couldn't hand over the class to prospective teachers from time to time. We wouldn't harm our students unduly. And a student who prepares to teach a lesson to his fellows in class prepares far better than he ever would as just a student.

I recall that the professor's criticisms of our teaching and presentation of material were very valuable.

In brief, let't start doing something for our future teachers ...<u>even our future college teachers</u>...Goodness knows, many of them could stand an NDEA summer institute...And while we're here, let's say a word about these institutes.

Dr. Allen has told us that these institutes have been operating for eight years. Each year there are more of them, and each year a greater percentage of our teachers have been to one. Many have now been to two.

I'm here to say that any teacher who feels during an institute that he's not making progress, thinks differently the first time that he's back in front of the class.

The conclusion is that institutes are valuable and worthwhile.

Colleges and universities are pleased to offer them. But what do the institutes <u>do</u> during the summer?
They do what the university inself did not do during the student's four years. They correct their own mistakes.

The disappointing thing to me is that of all the colleges offering institutes, very few of them have reorganized their regular curriculums for teachers.

IN SHORT, THEY CONTINUE TO MILL OUT LANGUAGE TEACHERS WHO NEED AN INSTITUTE THE DAY THEY RECEIVE A DIPLOMA.

What conclusions can we make here?

Generally:

1. Get more activity...more life into the language program.
2. Separate or single out the majors and those who are interested, and do something for them.
3. Develop some curriculum for people not interested in literary classics.
4. Conduct classes in the language, particularly advanced courses.
5. Develop a better system for placing incoming freshmen.

For teaching majors:

1. Get involved in the teacher education program in your college. Demand from the education department a role in the supervision of student teachers.
2. Reorganize those methods courses. Make them meaningful. Get help from high school teachers, if you need it. They have good ideas and are willing to help.
3. Develop an oral proficiency test for prospective teachers. A major certificate is not enough.
4. Allow students to teach from time to time. This won't hurt anything, and it will do them a lot of good.
5. If your school does conduct an institute, look at your own regular curriculum to see if you're not in the embarrassing situation of correcting your own mistakes.

Let me say, in conclusion, that no college is deficient in all respects, but each deficiency exists somewhere.

It is my hope that through meetings such as this one, we may call attention to some of these problem areas.

APPENDIX E

Selections from:

THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM IN

WASHOE COUNTY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

A SURVEY

by C. W. F. Melz (Reno, 1965)

Table 9

Table 10

Pages 34-36, items 1-10

Appendix C (pages C1-C5)

(see main text, Section V, Recommendation No. 6)

Table 9

REASONS FOR NOT CONTINUING H.S. LANGUAGE AND FOR STARTING A NEW LANGUAGE IN COLLEGE

New Language Preferred	Poor Preparation	H.S. Language Disliked	Time Lapse	New Language Required	Schedule Difficulties	Total
101	55	41	37	27	5	266

The major reason given for not continuing with the H.S. language is the desire to study a new language. Most of the students expressing this reason had Latin in H.S. and wished to learn a modern language. Those that disliked the H.S. language did not necessarily dislike the teacher as can be seen from their comments.

The comparatively small number that stated the time lapse between H.S. and University as their reason is surprising. It must be, however, kept in mind that a fair number of those continuing with the H.S. language had also a time lapse, usually of one year.

A special study was made of the success of all freshmen in second year or advanced language classes during the Fall semester of 1964. The results are represented in Table 10.

There are several points of interest in this table: first, the high percentage of A's and B's as mid-semester and final grades, 54% and 55%; second, the few failures and withdrawals; third, the improvement made by the poorer (D) students during the last part of the semester. Since 41% of this group came from Washoe County schools, the local FL teachers may justly claim a good part of the credit for the achievement of their former students. It should also be noted that 15 students in second-year classes, 11 in French and 4 in Spanish had a three-year H.S. preparation and should have taken the second-semester course of the second college year. This course, however, was not offered in the Fall so that the students either had to wait until Spring to follow the proper sequence in their language study or forego the credit for their third-year H.S. language and take the Fall semester course of the second college year. The fault here lies with the Foreign Language Department at the University in not providing the opportunity for continuing the H.S. language without a semester's break.

TABLE 10

FRESHMEN IN SECOND-YEAR AND ADVANCED LANGUAGE CLASSES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO, FALL, 1964. DISTRIBUTION OF MID-SEMESTER AND FINAL GRADES.

GRADES	A		B		C		D		F		W	To-	No. of College Instruct. Concerned	Freshmen from Washoe County Schools
	Mid-Sem.	Final	Mid-Sem.	Final	Mid-Sem.	Final	Mid-Sem.	Final	Mid-Sem.	Final	Final	tal		
French 2nd yr.														
(2 yr. H.S.)	2	2	10	7	6	11	5			2	1	23	3	11
(3 yr. H.S.)	2	2	5	6	2	2	2	1				11	3	1
French 3rd yr.														
(4 yr. H.S.)	1	2	2	1	1	1						4	2	1
German 2nd yr.														
(2 yr. H.S.)	2	2	1	4	3	1	2	1				8	1	6
Italian 2nd yr.														
(2 yr. H.S.)			1		1	3	1					3	1	3
Spanish 2nd yr.														
(2 yr. H.S.)	2	4	15	14	11	10	5	4	2	3		35	3	13
(3 yr. H.S.)	1	1	1	1	2	2						4	3	1
Spanish 3rd yr.														
(4 yr. H.S.)		1	7	6	1					1		8	1	4
Totals	10	14	42	39	27	30	15	6	2	6	1	96		40 or 41.6%

In the first and second year of modern languages, audiolingual texts are generally used, although the audiolingual approach is consistently practiced only by an estimated one-third of the instructors. It is the author's candid opinion that many of the observations in the preceding chapter on the method are not only valid for high school teachers, but for college instructors as well.

As a former chairman of the department and as a senior member of twenty-four years' service, the author fully realizes that college instructors are the most independent and individualistic members of the teaching profession. These qualities are to be appreciated by advanced students who need to be exposed to different approaches, stimulated by a variety of ideas, and forced to deal with the challenge thrust toward them by different personalities. The beginner, however, should feel that his language instruction is carried out systematically and evenly in all classes so that a change from one section to another necessitated by the change in his schedule from one semester to the next does not hamper his progress. In the same way, the freshman entering the University with an FL preparation of several years should feel confident that his continuation in an FL college class is not made difficult by arbitrary standards and willful procedures of individual instructors.

The department should be aware of its role within the national FL program and the local program as well. The following suggestions are intended to alert the department to that effect.

1. The rule that a student may fulfill his FL requirement in the

College of Arts and Science by taking one year each in two languages should be rescinded. Since the high school student should be advised against the insufficient two-year FL program, the college student should be required to take four semesters in one language to assure fair proficiency in it and not a nodding acquaintance with two. In the interest of better language learning, the department should bring this point to the attention of the faculty of the college of Arts and Science.

2. The department should institute a series of meetings in which aims and methods for first and second-year courses, also courses in composition and conversation and surveys of literature are discussed and agreed upon.

3. The department should urge its members to observe class instruction in foreign languages on all levels, from the seventh grade in Junior H.S. to all college classes, whenever possible. A new and exciting feature of the NDEA language institutes was the opportunity for any staff member to visit any class taught at the institute. Since method and demonstration classes in the institutes were conducted by highly qualified high school teachers, the academic institute staff was able to observe FL teaching in the schools at its best and profited greatly from it, as did the teachers from visiting the more academic classes. This is the most desirable kind of cooperation among FL teachers of all levels.

4. The larger number of the majors and minors in the department intend to teach foreign languages. Their knowledge of and experience in the language is chiefly derived from class work. The more they hear, the more they practice the FL in their classes, the better their preparation for teaching it.

Let it be resolved that the use of the English language is reduced to a bare minimum in all classes of the department, except in courses in linguistics and philology which might also be taken by students from other departments.

5. To promote an adequate graduate program, which the department has actually worked out but cannot implement, the University Administration should be asked to provide teaching assistants for the department to release qualified staff members from teaching beginning courses so that they may offer more advanced and graduate courses. These assistants should be subjected to careful training for and supervision in their teaching beginning language classes by experienced staff members. No effective graduate program can be stated in the department without the help of teaching assistants.

6. Whenever possible, advanced and graduate courses dealing with oral and written practice, linguistics and structural review in the three major foreign languages should be offered in late afternoon or evening hours for the benefit of local FL teachers.

7. The attempt should be made to offer advanced and graduate courses in foreign languages on the Reno Campus during the summer.

8. As soon as practical, the Italian and Russian programs should be expanded.

9. Student teachers in foreign languages should be supervised by a language specialist. The department should collaborate with the College of Education in determining whether a member of its own staff or of the staff in Education would be the most suitable for this job. At any rate,

this supervisor should have experience in teaching modern foreign languages according to modern techniques. Preferably, he should have taught in a NDEA language institute.

10. The department should insist that certification of language teachers be partly based on an acceptable degree of proficiency in foreign languages. Major and minor students intending to teach languages should be made aware of this fact early during their time of preparation. The degree of proficiency may be determined by administering national tests developed by the MLA for the four basic language skills.

APPENDIX C

Selected and classified comments from college students (see Appendix A) concerning their H.S. instruction in FLs.

1. Method

My chief difficulty was the change in stress. In high school, speaking ability, not grammar, was emphasized. In college I found the opposite was true. Now I flounder with rules and tenses I really never noticed before.

Spent too much time learning dialogues and never learned the fundamental rules.

I feel that the audiolingual method taught in high school doesn't prepare a student for the grammatical usages which one would encounter in the college course. (I would have failed French)

Our instructor believed in teaching conversational French and because I knew so little grammar I feel I would flunk a 200 course (2nd year college).

The study was centered around grammar and verb conjugation and not much practical usage.

I learned the language very fast and enjoyed the way in which it was taught. All of the students were carrying on conversations in French by the end of two years.

It involved mostly the memorizing of vocabulary lists with little grammar or practice in speaking. The tests were 95% vocabulary.

I believe that it is much better to learn the grammar, vocabulary, etc., and then learn how to speak than to learn to speak and not know what you are saying as retention is very poor in this method!!

Not enough interstudent conversation in that language class.

Not enough stress was placed on translation to give the course any real value.

Good concentration on vocabulary and pronunciation but not so much on usage.

Our instructor taught grammar and vocabulary of Spanish and really pounded it into us, but there was not much speech practice or listening and comprehending.

We only memorized dialogues which gave very little fundamentals of the language and little speaking ability.

Teacher spent very little time on speaking: all emphasis was on writing.

I found difficulty in the change from the traditional method to the contemporary method. I also had trouble with one teacher teaching Castilian and another South American Spanish.

In the 9th grade - poor - I learned many things which I later learned were wrong. In high school, generally FAIR, with the exception of 3rd year French from Miss ---- which was excellent, as we read literature and much study was required. I learned grammar very well, but still cannot speak French as fluently as I feel I should.

The courses were all grammar.

I noticed that the ALM method of mainly speaking presents a certain amount of difficulty with the grammar taught in college. This I observed, however, not from my own experience, but from that of my fellow students.

The 101 & 102 courses in language at the university are taught much in the same manner as I was taught in my last two years of high school, but I wasn't prepared adequately in high school for the great amount of Spanish grammar I encountered here. We went into grammar very little in high school.

Grammar was lacking since there was so much emphasis on spoken Spanish. Today I would not be able to make up my own sentences but I could read with good accent.

Not enough emphasis was put on becoming familiar with the language, rather, it was repeating basic sentences and changing them according to grammatical rules and not understanding the words. It was too mechanical.

I had two different instructors for two different years and both taught completely different. The first one taught the old way; the second one taught the new way.

I have no confidence in <u>speaking</u> and I will not find the elementary conversation practice that I need in a college course.

The instruction was fair - my first year was very poor and I received a poor foundation in my first year - and encountered considerable difficulty in writing the language.

No real difficulties. ALM was very helpful and complete.

The audiolingual method is much easier (than the grammatical). You never learn much grammar, and can achieve good grades without effort.

The course wasn't challenging enough for college bound students.

Not enough practical application. Also we talked in lab but did <u>not know</u> what we were saying.

I got good grades in Spanish, but didn't put forth any effort and did not know my Spanish well.

My Spanish instruction was <u>fair</u>. My German instruction was <u>good</u> except that all we learned was pronunciation and not grammar.

I felt the instructor was excellent but I also felt that the ALM program did not teach the student any grammar or very little vocabulary.

My background was too far behind me and too limited. I needed help with verbs and vocabulary. Studying mostly grammar and little conversation makes me inept at speaking and understanding.

I didn't care for fourth year French because we never did anything, and I lost interest in French.

There was 1 instructor teaching 7 courses a day. There was no practice for speaking in the other language of German. Interest in the field of language was not inspired among the students.

The language instruction was fair, but the audiolingual was new and the instructors had to learn also how to teach it.

My background in Spanish in high school was good so the college courses were not difficult; in fact, I didn't feel they were challenging enough.

I didn't learn the grammatical part of Spanish well enough to take advanced Spanish. Also, I wanted to learn a new language.

Not enough study required.

I seem to have a good background for this 203 course. After 2 years of high school French I was convinced I hadn't learned a thing, but this apparently is not the case.

I had been used to audiolingual where French was spoken but not seen. There was little grammar studied. So when I came to college I had no background for the written course.

My teachers knew even less about the method of teaching than I did. Both knew nothing about the French language and therefore were unable to teach adequately. Therefore I know nothing about what I'm doing now.

The entire concentration on audiolingual in high school left me unprepared for any drill in written grammar.

I did not know anything about verb conjugation or past tenses. Also many words I know for speaking but not for writing.

I feel my accent could not be better. I am fully in favor of audiolingual but it must be continued to do any good.

The so-called ALM method is a farce and an insult to intelligence. Through this approach, modern educators seem to think it is more important to be able to order butter than understand the language.

My 2 years of ALM material constitutes less than a year of college material I am sure. I have purchased a first year book and am trying to catch up on my own. The biggest problem is grammar, both in terms and practice, and the use of various prepositions. I have difficulty in choosing the correct preposition to use. The pronunciation aspect of ALM is excellent; however it should be supplemented in high school (2nd year) by a first year German college-level book.

Much of the sentence structures, the dative case and vocabulary was not stressed or even covered at all in German.

Some of the fundamentals were learned and pronunciation but not enough grammar or vocabulary.

The high school ALM method did not adequately prepare me to cope with college German - vocabulary is small and lack of grammatical knowledge.

2. <u>Teacher</u>

I felt the teacher due to her travels in other countries, to the class was more interesting, but she herself was too easy on grading.

The particular instructor would have been better if he hadn't been so "easy going".

He was not extremely helpful. He merely read to us from the text.

The teacher was dull, the lessons too simple, and discipline in the class was non-existent.

Although I received very high grades in Spanish, my teachers were very lax and I do not feel I know enough about Spanish to take an advanced college course.

Freshman French I took in junior high school. We were not made to do anything. The teacher talked about his war experiences.

Exceptionally smart teachers but they had poor teaching methods - not strict enough.

For both teachers it was their first year teaching and they weren't too sure what they were doing. In second year we tried the audiolingual method for awhile and then changed back to the book method, so we only got through 1st year grammar.

Under Mrs. --- the language instruction was excellent. We learned about all phases of life in Spain. We learned songs and poems. In addition to going along with the book, our class had informal conversations in Spanish, gave speeches in Spanish, and discussed the history of Spain. We saw slides she had taken in Spain. She was an inspiration to me, and because of her classes, I have decided to major in Spanish. My most enjoyable high school experiences were in her class.

The teachers were well qualified, but some couldn't manage the class making it difficult for some to learn.

The teacher was good, but didn't work us hard enough.

My teacher was more interested in the athletic department than Spanish. He did not make us work enough, especially in the second year.

My Spanish teacher had lived in Spain and Mexico, she could speak the language like a native. She coupled her teaching with stories and culture periods.

I enjoyed the class because the teacher did not limit himself to strict grammar instruction - he talked about culture and ideas. However, I don't believe I really got a strong background.

I didn't feel that she had very good control over her class. She seemed to know the language fairly well, but didn't get it across to her students.

I had much difficulty learning Spanish because the teachers teaching it had probably never heard any real natives speak and had some difficulty in doing so themselves.

I did not feel that my teacher had any real interest in teaching.

It was mainly verbs, singular words, and translation.

Fair, she did not take time to let the individual understand what was happening. She made learning Spanish an unliked task instead of an enjoying one.

3. Teacher-student relation

There was too much emphasis on the ALM method and not enough teacher-student relationship.

I believe it was much less personal than college courses and had little individual stimulus and help.

All tests were oral and they weren't very important as to our final grade. He showed very little interest. The students were bored and lost during the greatest part of the two years. We were never taught rules or standard ideas to go on in learning the language.

Too much emphasis was placed on the ALM method and not enough on student-teacher relationship.

The instructor did not take any personal interest in the student, but only taught the course as one unit. If one student was behind, he couldn't receive special help.

4. Tempo

There wasn't enough oral work. The last year our class as a whole did not accomplish much; we didn't seem to progress.

Very slow. Time wasted.

I could not continue because I didn't have enough background to do the work sufficiently. In two years we barely covered one year's course of study.

I felt that the instruction was good but could have been improved by moving faster along.

I learned very little in high school.

I find that college languages are more difficult because they go much faster. I also find that I am learning much more now in college.

The Spanish was fair, we went very slowly and didn't learn rapidly. It was often boring. Part of this may be due to the fact that many students took Spanish because it was supposed easy. They didn't work too hard.

The German was very good. We went at a faster rate and had a better class. The teacher wa more interesting.

In college quantity rather than quality is the apparent goal and I felt that it was hard to adjust to the rapid speed of learning so much.

5. Laboratory

Good instructor, but no laboratory and not many other aids.

The language lab was not used enough, and not enough conversational Spanish spoken.